India

FOR THE

No. 14. New Series.
No. 108. Old Series.

WEEK ENDING FRIDAY, APRIL 8, 1898.

Registered as a Newspaper. | Price...... 2d. By Post, 2½d.

Notes and News 209
The Recent Riot in Bombay 212
England and India: A "*Leonina Societas*."—II. 213
The Law of Sedition, by E. H. Pickersgill, M.P. 214
The Strange Case of the Khots ... 215
"Representative Indians" 216
The Week in Parliament 217
Chronicle of the Week 218
The New Law of Sedition: Sir W. Wedderburn's Letter to the *Daily Chronicle* 219
The Indian Budget: Opinions of the British Press 219
India in Parliament 222
Advertisements 223-224

NOTES AND NEWS.

PARLIAMENT adjourned on Tuesday for the Easter recess without any discussion upon the present reign of terror in India. The last day before the holidays was taken up with a voluminous if not instructive debate upon the international scramble in the Far East—a topic which has been filling the newspapers and absorbing the attention, if any, of the House of Commons for some weeks past. The sense of proportion seems to be strangely lacking in that short-sighted creature, the modern Imperialist. Opinions differ—even, it would seem, in the Cabinet itself—on the question what policy, or whether any consistent policy at all, has been pursued by the British Government in the Far Eastern business. But it is generally admitted that the interest of the United Kingdom, or of the British Empire, in China is purely commercial, and all the pother of the past few months has arisen from an apprehension either that our trade might suffer, or that the trade of some of our rivals might unduly grow, in that quarter of the world. To contrast with this relatively small and contingent danger the problems which are offered by the present condition of India is to measure the folly of short-sighted Imperialism. We are wonderfully keen, it appears, upon some possible gain in the Far East, but we are not more than momentarily disturbed about the colossal interests—commercial and other—which the British Empire has at stake in the welfare of India.

In this connexion we may refer to a notable article by Dr. Bridges which appears in the current issue of that admirable periodical, the *Positivist Review*. The subject of the article is the relation of Patriotism to Imperialism "which it is now sought to encase in patriotic veneer," and Dr. Bridges says of our empire in India:

> The government of British India, like that of the Dutch and the French East Indies, rests, distinctly and avowedly, on material force; force modified doubtless by the moral restraints of humanity and justice, which are strongly operative in each of these three cases. On the unrighteous deeds connected with the original conquest there is no reason now to dilate. The continuance of our dominion can only be justified ethically if the result be what it was in the case of the conquest of Gaul and Spain by Rome: a steady progress towards identification of the conqueror and the conquered, ending in the entire removal of all political and social disabilities. So long as this result remains doubtful it will be best to refrain from exultation at the maintenance of our Indian empire. . . . That the country is growing richer under our sway is often strongly stated, but has also, and especially of late years, been strongly doubted. But the test question remains, Are we preparing India for self-government? Are we making progress towards obliteration of the social distinction between the governing-class and the governed? Unless and until these questions can be answered satisfactorily, no one who knows what patriotism really means can pretend to feel patriotic exultation at the maintenance of our Indian empire. We may accept it as a duty inherited from the past. We may recognise its necessity as the only means available for avoiding the miserable anarchy that would follow a successful invasion of India. But to be proud of it is another matter altogether.

"The test question remains, Are we preparing India for self-government? Are we making progress towards obliteration of the social distinction between the governing class and the governed?" Let the new law of sedition, and the continued neglect of the resolution of the House of Commons in favour of simultaneous examinations to the Indian Civil Service, make answer.

In reply to Mr. Herbert Roberts on Monday last, Lord George Hamilton apparently declined to bring on the second reading stage of the India Office Store Depôt Bill "at such a time as would give the House an opportunity for adequately discussing it." Lord G. Hamilton, with something less than courtesy, suggested that Mr. Roberts had not read the Bill, and declared that "it does not require discussion." We are not so sure of this. The Bill (which we have read) is to empower the Secretary of State to purchase lands in connexion with the Store Department of the India Office. The memorandum explains that the Secretary of State holds on lease the ground on which the larger part of the Store Depôt stands, and is assignee of the leasehold interest in an adjoining piece of land "used for the same purpose." The first lease has sixty years, and the second lease only two or three years, to run. The Bill accordingly gives compulsory power of purchasing the smaller plot "at a price hereafter to be agreed on by arbitration," this plot being described as "absolutely necessary in order satisfactorily to carry on the work of the depôt." We should have thought that there was ample ground for discussion here. If all that one hears is true, there are few things which more urgently need discussion than the work of the India Office Store Depôt. A Bill to disburse money in order to facilitate or extend that work affords a suitable occasion for such discussion.

The Further Papers regarding the Famine and Relief Operations in India during the years 1896-7 (No. V), which have just been issued to Parliament, contain the "narrative and results of the measures adopted for the relief of famine" by the Government of the North-West Provinces and Oudh. Throughout the whole period of the famine the reports from the Government of the United Provinces have been conspicuous for clearness, completeness, and a certain air of willingness to impart information, not always to be found in other reports. We have often had occasion to criticise adversely the various famine papers of the Government of India, and to point to them as instances of how not to convey information. We can therefore with the more pleasure award to the volume now under notice really high praise. The whole narrative is simple and business-like; the maps, of which there are many, are clear and instructive; and there are charts and diagrams to show rainfall, prices, and death-rates. What makes these latter specially valuable is that they show the actual in relation to the normal in such a way that the reader can easily grasp the incidents of the famine in these important particulars. It is a really admirable report. But, then, it is the report of the Government of the North-West Provinces and Oudh, and not—most emphatically not—the report of the Government of India. Perhaps that helps to account for its excellence.

Nothing could be better than the directness with which the narrative goes to the point in its opening sentences. They are worth reproducing as a model for the Supreme Government to copy, discarding those interminable and misleading qualifications which are sometimes so dear to the official mind.

> This narrative deals with the famine which visited the North-Western Provinces and Oudh during the years 1896 and 1897. These provinces cover an area of 107,000 square miles, and in 1891 contained a population of 46,905,085 or nearly 47 millions. It is believed that the population has since increased. At one period or other during 1896 and 1897 every part of this great territory was to a greater or less extent affected by crop failure, entailing scarcity of food or high prices. In one-third of the area there was famine; in another third there was scarcity; and in the remainder there was the pressure which famine prices cause. Previous famines or scarcities—and there have been many—affected only limited portions of the provinces. This is the first occasion within historic memory that the entire country has been so severely afflicted.

This brevity of expression is admirably maintained throughout. It is very welcome in the chapter dealing

with public health during the famine period. There in the second paragraph we find it stated fairly and squarely, "*The death-rate is the best test of the sufficiency or insufficiency of a relief organisation.*" Tried by this test the United Provinces have fared well, as we shall show when we return to this report at greater length next week. The point we wish to emphasize now is the refreshing candour and freedom from circumlocution which so honourably distinguish this report among Government publications.

Before we leave this topic for the present, there are one or two extracts from the concluding pages which we may reproduce at once. Referring to the political effect of the measures taken by the Government to save its subjects from the effects of famine, the report says:

Some officers report that there are no noticeable manifestations of gratitude. Other officers, and these not the least observant, give an entirely different opinion, and say that the feeling of gratitude is deep and widespread among all classes. An observant European officer noticing the confidence with which the children, at first timid, now meet advances, writes as follows: "The utter confidence of the children" (in the Government official) "is a curious and very touching thing to see. Young lads and children have keen ears and close memories. Their looks and manners are the surest indication of what kind of pictures their parents paint in their home talk. The pictures must be in warm and glowing colours." A most trustworthy Native officer says that in his district the feeling of the people finds expression in the saying that the *Sarkâr* has saved them from ruin like that of a *Bharat*. A *Bharat* is that war of universal desolation which is familiarised to the Hindu mind by the great Hindu epic.

As further evidence of national gratitude, the report notices that the ballads of the *Holi* festival last March (1897), sang in rude verse the story of the bountiful charity that was being then dispensed, and adds: "The songs of the people disclose their thoughts."

The Government has issued a third batch of papers on the Plague, extending from May 31, 1897, to February 3, 1898. The Blue-book is mainly occupied with statistics and regulations, occasionally with opinions. Any substantial contribution from the Secretary of State is conspicuously absent. The resolution of the Government of India in the Sanitary section of the Home Department, dated February 3, 1898, seems to show a marked improvement upon the attitude previously adopted. But the proof of the pudding is in the eating, and the value of a regulation lies in its judicious enforcement; and really there is not a syllable discernible in this Blue-book from which one can gather any idea as to how the work has been executed.

The Government express themselves as doubtful whether the inspection of corpses "is likely to be of great assistance, and they fear that its general introduction would be repugnant to the feelings of the people." But this conclusion, which should have been reached at a very early stage, was not adopted till much friction had arisen over the practice. Again:—

The Governor-General in Council has been much impressed by the readiness and docility with which the people in many of the infected areas have discarded their prejudices and submitted to removal from their houses, and his Excellency in Council feels confident that, if the necessity for the measure is carefully explained to them, the co-operation of leading men obtained as far as possible, and every consideration shown to the feelings and habits of those to whom the regulations have to be applied, this measure will be accepted without objection by the people of a locality in which plague has made its appearance.

Nothing could be more satisfactory than this deliverance. Yet is quite apparent that, in Bombay at least, as well as in Poona, the fundamental assumption of the Government has been neglected, with the result of spoiling the whole of their expectations and intentions. But there is nothing in this Blue-book to indicate that the outcome has been otherwise than in accordance with the regulation. Once more:—

In public as well as in private plague hospitals, all possible consideration should be shown to the feelings of the inmates, and in especial caste distinctions and the privacy of females who do not appear in public should be carefully respected.

Yet we read in Indian papers that such hospitals are so desperately uncomfortable that the people will rather risk death at home than enter them, and the Secretary of State has been questioned in Parlaiment on the basis of allegations of violation of the privacy of *purdah* women. If Blue-books would only tell us something we want to know, what a different world it would be.

There is, however, a report by Mr. J. A. Lowson, the Plague Commissioner in Bombay, dated May 5, 1897, which calls for notice. He says, for instance, that "the hospital arrangements were greatly improved by the presence of the nurses, but the doctors in charge, Doctors ——— and ———, *had no idea of their real duties in a hospital in such a trying time*, first-class at giving orders, but never putting a hand forward to *do* anything." The first italics are ours; the italicised *do* is Mr. Lowson's. Now is this so? Will anyone who knows the kind of practical training that these doctors must have had readily accept this statement? If it is true, what has been done with them? Who are they? What are their names? Again, says Mr. Lowson:—

Most of the local officials are of little or no use, hence my suggesting the use of, say, six Europeans to assist. *I do not agree with the opinion* so often expressed by people who have had no experience of plague work *that "Tommies" are not the men to do plague work amongst the Natives.* I only suggest that Europeans should be utilised, and the only ones that I imagine can be had just now are non-commissioned officers, and there is not the slightest necessity for them going in uniform. *The way they conduct themselves generally depends on the ability of their leader to keep them in order.*

The Government has now decided against Mr. Lowson, that "Tommies are the men to do plague work amongst the Natives"; and the last sentence of the extract is sufficiently significant of the grounds of that decision.

Before we leave this subject, it may be well to refer again to the remarkable correspondence between the Government of India and the Bombay Government contained in the earlier Blue-book on the plague (c. 8511 of 1897). We there find the Government of India, in telegrams and memoranda despatched from distant Calcutta, urging upon the Government of Bombay severe measures which Lord Sandhurst, knowing the local circumstances and difficulties, found it necessary to resist. Here is an extract from the reply of the Bombay Government (February 12, 1897) to a series of suggestions of this kind:—

Great difficulty has attended all attempts at the segregation of healthy inmates of infected houses hitherto made, and very limited success has been achieved. From the beginning of the outbreak of this disease it has been found that the Native inhabitants of the city are very reluctant to leave their houses or to allow any member of their family afflicted with the disease to be taken away. Indeed, their dread of the disease itself appears to be hardly so powerful as their horror of being removed from their houses. Ignorance and superstition prevent them from discerning that removal to a hospital is good for the sick, or removal to [? from] infected dwellings good for the healthy, and they are far more easily moved by fear of the municipal and police authorities than by any realisation of the benefits that will accrue from a sensible course of action. It is estimated that not less than 300,000 persons have already fled from Bombay, moved so to do, not only by fear of the plague, but quite as much, if not more, by an unfounded and unreasonable fear of what might happen to them at the hands of the police and municipal authorities were they to remain.

One would like to know how far the recent disturbances in Bombay were due (1) to plague measures adopted by the authorities, against their own judgment, but in obedience to orders from Calcutta—and from Whitehall; and (2) to the employment of European soldiers.

The half-yearly return to Parliament of East India loans raised in England and India, makes a rather late appearance this year. The current return relates to loans raised and outstanding as at September 30, 1897. It is of the usual type, indicating with painful fidelity the unbroken continuity of the growth of India's debt. Let us summarise the figures:—

Loans raised in India.

Outstanding on April 1, 1897	..	Rx. 109,115,053
" " Sept. 30, 1897	..	111,295,979
Net increase of debt for half-year ..		Rx. 2,180,926

Loans raised in England.

Outstanding on April 1, 1897	..	£114,883,233
" " Sept. 30, 1897	..	120,829,060
Net increase of debt for half-year ..		£ 5,945,827

There it is in incontrovertible figures—six millions sterling and two crores added to the debt in the financial year that has closed. A week or two ago we were told what it is contemplated to add of net debt during the current financial year. Adding on these figures we have the

following result as representing approximately what will be the debt of India on September 30, 1898 :—

Loans raised in India .. .. Rx. 114,000,000
Loans raised in England .. £123,000,000

In this calculation the Government of India is given credit for the debentures to be paid off, while no account has been taken of the substitution of £6,000,000 of permanent for £6,000,000 of temporary debt. When are these loans going to abate—we will not say cease?

The *Indu-Prakash* castigates with some vigour the extraordinary speech of Sir Alexander Mackenzie in the Viceroy's Council upon the Sedition Bill. It repudiates as "utterly groundless, not to use a stronger expression," his allegation that the Native Bombay Press "promulgated the most barefaced sedition." If it did, would not the Bombay authorities punish it? But, as Sir Alexander said, "some of the offenders had been convicted." "Well," says the *Indu-Prakash*, "we know how they were convicted. Can it at all be called a 'conviction,' when millions in India and thousands in England pronounce it unfair and as due to an unreasonable panic?" Sir Alexander says they "sympathise with convicted traitors." "'Convicted' Mr. Tilak is," admits our contemporary; "but *not one* of the three hundred millions of India will call him a 'traitor.'" Sir Alexander speaks of a "class of discontented men pining for the plunder of the State and its offices." "A more reckless and monstrous charge," replies the *Indu-Prakash*, "was never yet made against the most loyal section of the Indian people—the educated classes. They, and they alone, are the chief support of British rule in India. . . . Naturally, this education which Sir Alexander so vehemently curses has taught us to call a spade a spade. It has enabled us to detect the drawbacks of the system of government, and even made us discontented."

The *Prabhat*, a Mahometan journal of Hyderabad in Sind, expresses itself very frankly on what the *Indu-Prakash* designates "the Black Act of 1898":

So at last we are muzzled! The die is cast. The "Sedition Bill" is now a law of the land. Henceforward we cannot, without risking our neck, speak freely and openly when exposing wrong and injustice. We dare not denounce the wrong-doer as he might deserve, but must perforce play the part of noodles, euphemising, apologising, and neutralising. The function of the publicist even now is not an enviable one, in all conscience; it is by no means pleasant to criticise men and measures and thereby make enemies. But it will be ten times harder under the new law. It will be galling to all who are not absolutely wanting in self-respect. But it is useless repining any more. There is no help for it but that we must submit to the inevitable.

When such a cry as this comes from a Mahometan paper, even Lord G. Hamilton must admit that there is matter in the complaint. But the Government apparently imagines that the last people whose opinion should be considered on the Press law are the "gentlemen of the Press" themselves.

The *Madras Times*, which designated the Sedition Act as *stupidissimus ac stultissimus*, remarks sensibly enough :—

It is a timorous exhibition of weakness to seek to stifle criticism. Better to hear a seditiously-minded people crying sedition aloud, than to have them crying out "God Save the Queen" and secretly undermining her Government. We are not disposed to believe that there is any such folly as seditious spirit abroad in India—or, at any rate, we believe that there is no sedition that the Government need be so much afraid of as to be passing a retrograde law for its own protection. The people of India, like the people of every respectable country under the sun, desire to progress in their own country, and that they *must* progress is a truth that history preaches. . . . The passing of the present Bill will, we verily believe, be of disastrous tendency for British rule. A retrograde movement is always regrettable, even when there is a necessity for a retreat; in the present case there is no necessity save in the timid imaginations of a timid Government. In the second place, the spirit of the people is thoroughly roused against such a measure; and, finally, it must surely be evident to most people that what is practically an attempt to tame the people and the Press into a hang-dog equanimity for anything that the Government may choose to do or say, is a miserable policy.

But the Government of India is convinced that loyalty is synonymous with formal acquiescence, and that dissent is synonymous with disloyalty. It leaves the papers ample freedom—to praise official acts of all kinds.

When the Government is busy passing Acts to check the intolerable licence of the Press—meaning the Native Press—and to visit with condign punishment the crime of setting class against class, what has it to say to a passage like this, contributed by an Anglo-Indian to the columns of the *Indian Daily News* of Calcutta?

We (Englishmen) see now the fruits of our labours. The ancestors of those ungrateful Indians were formerly tillers of the soil, and through our benevolence and liberal spirit and our duty as a Christian Government, we spent money in educating and making them civilised. They have succumbed, however, to the disease of heredity; and to the end of all time under the most lenient Government these blood-eruptions will show out. *We should have followed the treatment of Americans towards Red Indians*—exterminated the whole show.

We should be very sorry to regard this passage as a fair illustration of "our benevolence and liberal spirit," or of the Christian temper of the Government. If money was spent by the Government in educating the vipers, whose money was it, if not their own? If there is not a pillory in Calcutta, there ought to be one; and the writer of this precious screed ought to stand in it.

A correspondent writes that "under the bright sun of India the Viceregal appetite for coercive laws becomes very Goliathan indeed." But, he asks:

What has the British branch of the Indian National Congress done in England? I do not know. But it has held no public meeting yet. Let it do so at once in St. James's Hall. All Indians in England to a man would attend. Let us show by our action here how oppressed we feel. The English people may be moved to action. The British branch is failing in its duty to India if it neglects to adopt this procedure.

The British Committee of the Indian National Congress, we believe, discussed some time ago the expediency of convening a large public meeting in London to protest against the new law of sedition in India, and came to the conclusion that the matter should first be fought out in Parliament. Our correspondent, we imagine, would hardly suggest that the Easter recess is a very favourable season for such a meeting. But if he will look over the pages of INDIA for the past six months or so, he may see something of what the British Committee has done.

The rumour of Lord Elgin's retirement has naturally aroused much interest in India. The *Indu-Prakash* refers to Lord Cadogan, Lord Balfour, Lord Londonderry, and Mr. George Curzon as mentioned. If India had any voice at all in the choice, our contemporary says, "she would have none of these." With the exception of Mr. Curzon, they are all "titled nobodies;" and as for Mr. Curzon—"well, we know what he is." No; this is the kind of man the Indians need and want:

We want a kind, honest, sincere and large-hearted statesman to rase to the bottom the terrible pyramid of unstatesman-like measures enacted by Lord Elgin. We want a man of strong character and iron will who will bridle the galloping ambition of military enthusiasts; one who will honestly try to follow the letter and the spirit of the noble Proclamation of 1858.

Beyond all comparison, Lord Balfour of Burleigh is the best of the batch, and a very capable man. It is his misfortune, however, to be official in cast of mind, as well as by training and by association. But certainly he is not, and would not be, a "nobody," even though he happens to be "titled."

The following passage from "Wanderings in Waziristan," contributed to the official *Pioneer*, should help to open people's eyes to the folly of the forward policy, which is still going merrily ahead:

There is no doubt that the people are poor and that the life is a hard one, the country only producing sufficient grain and forage for the people's own requirements. It may be imagined, therefore, what a calamity an army of occupation with its constant demands for forage, eggs, milk, poultry, cattle, sheep, and goats, is to such a people. We flatter ourselves we are introducing the blessings of civilisation amongst them; but in reality we are only sowing the seeds of envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness, and the more one sees of the country and its people the more one asks the question: *que diable allons nous faire dans cette galere?*

Lord George Hamilton and Lord Roberts enlarge on our Christian duty to these poor benighted folk. Yet the representative of the chief official paper in India tells them that they call their panacea by a wrong name.

At an ordinary meeting of the London Indian Society held on April 2, the following resolution was passed :— "That the London Indian Society, representing the Indians of all communities in the United Kingdom, learns with deep regret the lamentable death of Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, K.C.S.I., LL.D., and tenders its sincerest condolence to his relatives and friends. India has sustained in him an irreparable loss, for he was an indefatigable leader, and an ardent sympathiser and promoter of the social and educational cause."

THE RECENT RIOT IN BOMBAY.

On Wednesday, March 9, serious rioting broke out in Bombay among a Mahometan section of the population, through resentment at the measures adopted to stamp out the plague. Four Europeans and ten Indians lost their lives, many were injured more or less severely, and the whole community appears to have been agitated with apprehension. Hospitals were put to the flames, and district plague offices and ambulances were destroyed. On March 18, the effect of the excitement was felt at Hubli, on the Southern Mahratta Railway. The Mahometans there, learning what had taken place at Bombay, decided to offer resistance to the plague operations, and it seems that only the military promptitude of the Collector averted a conflict. These outbreaks are not merely dangerous in themselves. They are still more dangerous in the example they offer. It therefore becomes highly important to get at the root of the matter, and see why it was precisely that this outbreak took place on March 9 at Bombay.

The outbreak was not the only manifestation of discontent with the plague measures. There had been a widespread and bitter strike based ostensibly at least on the same or similar grounds. The authorities seem to have had ample warning that the materials were all ready for a blaze, and waiting only for the spark to be applied. "For some weeks past," says the *Bombay Gazette*, writing so soon as the outbreak occurred, "there has been much uneasiness and alarm amongst large sections of the Native community in Bombay." "For some weeks past"; and the "uneasiness" was "much"; and not only was there uneasiness, but even "alarm." It is impossible to suppose that something of this was not known by the Government as well as by other people. What was the cause of this excited and exacerbated condition of popular feeling? The *Bombay Gazette* says it was "caused, not so much by the continued prevalence of the plague, as by the growing stringency of the measures taken to combat it." Such stringency may, of course, have been absolutely necessary. But what one wants to get at is the facts of the case—the persons employed, the methods of action prescribed to them, and the actual way in which those methods were carried into practice. "Commissioned officers of long experience and tried discretion," the *Bombay Gazette* assures us, "were in charge of the operations." But in the next breath it declares that "it is useless to deny that the Plague Committee, as at present constituted, is in many respects deficient alike in touch and grasp." This throws the blame back on the Committee, with allegations of incompetence. "It was a grave fault," the writer adds, "in view of manifest symptoms of a growing spirit of dissatisfaction and resistance, to leave weak and defenceless groups of searchers to carry on their bitterly-resented visitations without adequate and visible material support sufficient to preclude any possibility of riot or insurrection." This, of course, is one point not to be ignored. But what one wants to know particularly is the fundamental thing. Why were the visitations so "bitterly resented"?

The *Times of India* says nothing to conflict with the *Bombay Gazette*. On the contrary, it takes the same view. The *Times of India*, as we stated last week, declares that "it would be affectation to think otherwise than with exceeding seriousness of the outbreak." It remarks also that "the dead set which at various points was made upon Europeans, irrespective of any relations they may have held to plague measures, but solely because they were Europeans, differentiates these riots from those of 1893." That is an ominous circumstance, certainly; and it emphasizes the duty of the Government by way of precaution, rather than, as the *Times of India* puts it, by way of retribution. The *Times of India* can see no mollifying element in the matter except the fact that "prime offenders belong to the poorest and most ignorant class of Mahometans." But the *Bombay Gazette* tells us that not only Mahometans, but also "certain elements of the Hindu population, excited by the celebration of the Holi holiday on the previous days, contributed to the elements of disturbance," although the Mahometans of the weaver caste and Sidis and the like were the most active in the rioting and work of destruction." Further, it says that "the Mahometans and Hindus of the better class were conspicuous by their absence wherever the mutinous crowds passed." This conspicuous absence is not, to our thinking, satisfactorily accounted for by the statement that the riot, though "so long anticipated," arose suddenly and spread rapidly, thereby preventing the leaders of the Mahometan community from exerting "any tranquillising influence." The unsatisfactory character of the explanation is aggravated by the various items of fact collected by both our contemporaries, going to show that the outbreak was premeditated, and intended to be widespread. The *Times of India* is specially definite on this point. It says that "there are grounds for believing the outbreak was not only carefully premeditated"—by whom? Not by the actual rioters in particular, but "by men who have influence over the weaving class." Who were these men? What are the alleged facts connecting them with the outbreak? The *Times of India*, it is reasonable to suppose, would not make such an allegation without substantial grounds, and the Government must know as much about the matter. Here, then, is a point of the utmost importance, which we hope to see investigated to the bottom. The *Times of India* goes on to allege a not less serious matter. It says there are grounds for believing "that extraneous influences were also at work which had little to do with resentment at plague measures, though they found in those measures an appropriate occasion for taking advantage of popular discontent." What were those extraneous influences? We want this point to be probed to the bottom also. Altogether, the load of blame that our contemporaries have accumulated on the head of the Government of Bombay is a very heavy burden indeed.

The *Indu-Prakash*, an excellent Indian journal, while it agrees to some extent with the Anglo-Indian journals above cited, strikes a deeper note. It refers to the whispers of charges of "ingratitude" as indicating the grave probability that the meaning of the outbreak may be "completely misunderstood by our rulers and by their countrymen." It protests after this view. "We are," it says, "as grateful as we can possibly be under the harrowing way in which unpopular plague measures are being stringently carried out." It denies point-blank that the riot had anything to do with "ingratitude;" it denies that there was any elaborate or premeditated "plot" of any kind; and it says the outbreak "was purely and simply the ebullition of the moment—the result of sudden exasperation, caused by the determination of a search party to remove a young Mahometan woman to a hospital." It points out that the plague was as virulent last year as to-day; that the Government measures were not a whit less stringent; and yet "not a word or breath of discontentment or resistance was even faintly heard." And why?

> The sole cause of it was that the administration of the plague measures was in the hands of a man of extraordinary sympathetic character, one who personally studied the wants and prejudices of the people and *felt* for their sufferings and their misery; and whose sympathy, instead of being an abstract virtue, took the form of positive sympathetic action; one who also *trusted* the people, and for the first time in the history of the plague saw the prudence of employing *native soldiers* for plague work, and the advisability of keeping Tommy Atkins out of the homes of the quiet Hindu and the fanatic Mahometan. That man was General Gatacre.

The italics in this extract are our contemporary's. The Government, says the *Indu-Prakash*, threw over the policy of General Gatacre, and adopted that of Mr. Rand; "British soldiers were imported from Poona to fight the plague, and the result was—the deplorable riot." Is the *Indu-Prakash* right? Are the allegations of the *Times of India* true? It is of the utmost consequence that these things should be fully investigated, both to clear or to inculpate individual Indians, and to let Englishmen know definitely how the matter stands. If the *Indu-Prakash* is right, military force may be more mischievous than remedial. Our contemporary pays a high tribute to the personal sympathy of Lord Sandhurst. But then, it goes on to say, "the incapacity and unsympathetic attitude of many of the officials, the extremely faulty arrangements made for segregating the people, the untold misery which they have had to suffer in these camps, the miserable condition of almost all the hospitals—all these combine to undo the good results of His Excellency's personal sympathy." Surely all this may be verified or refuted. At any rate, one cannot read this article in the *Indu-Prakash* without being satisfied as to its complete honesty and conviction, and being touched with the pathos of its lament over the action of the authorities.

On March 28, Mr. Maclean put a series of searching questions to Lord George Hamilton in the House of

Commons. Lord George Hamilton stated, *inter alia*, in reply, that "up to March 5, a certain number of specially selected British private soldiers were employed to visit Hindu houses if no objection was raised, but in no case did they visit Mahometan houses." He further stated that "no British soldier, whether officer or private, ever entered the room" of a Hindu or Mahometan woman by custom secluded from the gaze of men. Let us assume that Lord George has been correctly informed. He added that "the order for the employment of British soldiers was cancelled on March 5, four days before the riot began, and certain other changes were, I believe, under contemplation when the riot began and were carried into effect after it had taken place." Now, it is sufficiently obvious that, even if the employment of British soldiers was cancelled on March 5, such employment may have had a good deal to do with preparing the events of March 9. It is essentially necessary to have a full and thorough-going enquiry, open to all men to offer evidence of facts within their personal cognisance. For it is not merely the entering of particular houses or rooms that is in question. It is the whole conduct of the Committee (which Lord George Hamilton said had not resigned) and of British officers and soldiers employed. The *Bombay Gazette* itself gives up the Plague Committee, affirming categorically that "as at present constituted, it is in many respects deficient alike in touch and grasp." That is an accusation not to be lightly put aside and ignored. Then the *Indu-Prakash* declares that the people, while "not a whit against segregation," are yet "frightfully afraid of the abominable misery of the segregation camps." "Exposed for twelve hours to the scorching rays of the Indian sun, only to shiver again with the biting and bitter cold winds of the night, they prefer the possibly fatal dangers of an infected locality to the *insufferable tortures of a segregation camp*." Is this anything approaching a true description? If so, what has the Government to say? Then again: "What must be the feelings of the people when they see Tommy Atkins tramp up in the midst of their household gods, supremely callous to the social or religious susceptibilities of the inmates—people who consider the touch of a white man positive pollution?" All this may be as the *Indu-Prakash* puts it, "arrant nonsense"; but it is the feeling of the masses, and therefore it has to be reckoned with. The point is that all went well under General Gatacre; all has gone ill under the present administration. We ask, why? And we press for a thorough investigation, under circumstances permitting the whole truth to be exhibited to the peoples of India and of England.

ENGLAND AND INDIA: A "*LEONINA SOCIETAS*."

II.

We traced in a former article the dolorous history—dolorous so far as India is concerned—of the steady growth of the capitation payment charged to the Indian Government in respect of the cost of recruiting for the European forces serving in India. We showed how in spite of successive protests, India was made to pay more and more for a system of recruiting which is needlessly costly with reference to India's own requirements. We will now show how, while over-charging India for recruiting, the Imperial Government has freely used the Indian troops without the irksome formality of paying for their services. The exceptional period of the Mutiny is the one great instance of reinforcements being largely sent from England to the help of India. On the other hand England has borrowed troops from India on the occasions, and under the conditions following:—

England's Employment of Indian Troops.

Occasion.	Conditions.
1859-60.—China expedition: 18 regiments infantry besides cavalry, artillery, and a large part of the staff.	India relieved of all payments of the troops lent.
1860.—New Zealand: two regiments.	India paid ordinary expenses of troops while away.
1861.—New Zealand: one regiment.	,, ,,
1867.—Abyssinian Expedition: 16 regiments infantry, 5 regiments cavalry, 7 companies engineers, 5 batteries artillery, Commander and Staff.	England paid extraordinary expenses only. All ordinary charges of the troops paid by India, although she was deprived of their services.
1875.—Perak Expedition.	India paid ordinary expenses of troops while away.
1878.—Strengthening forces in Malta.	England paid all expenses.
1878-9.—Afghan War: 60,000 to 70,000 men employed.	Recognised as of Imperial concern by Parliament. India paid £18,000,000, England paid £5,000,000.
1882.—Egyptian Expedition: 5 regiments infantry, 3 regiments cavalry, 2 companies engineers, 2 batteries of artillery.	England paid only £500,000 towards the extraordinary expenses and none of the ordinary; India, besides paying all ordinary expenses, paid £800,000 away for extraordinary expenses.
1885.—Soudan Expedition.	India paid ordinary expenses of troops while away.
1896.—Troops at Suakin.	,, ,,

A pretty record in all conscience. But it follows upon one selfish fundamental rule. When India borrows troops of England, India has to pay the full cost from the date of embarkation from England. But when England borrows troops from India, India is called upon to go on defraying their ordinary charges, even for the time during which she is deprived of their services. Surely, to state this practice is to denounce it. Could anything be more palpably unjust to India? But this almost absurd injustice does not exhaust the unfairness of England's treatment of India even in this one matter of the effective charges of the Indian Army. Let us put in parallel columns the advantages which each country obtains from this partnership in the defensive forces of the Crown.

List of Advantages.

To England.	To India.
India is a training ground for the British Army in time of peace. For this England pays India nothing.	England is the recruiting ground for a third—but an important third—of the Indian Army. For this India pays England excessively.
The prospect of service in India, with higher rates of pay, encourages recruiting in the British Army.	
A large part of the Reserve at home has been trained in India at India's expense.	
The Indian Army is frequently employed on Imperial expeditions, India paying all the time, except for a few extras.	British troops would be loaned to India in an emergency upon payment of every expense from the day of embarkation to the day of their return to England.

Finally, before passing to a brief consideration of the non-effective charges, we may quote from a despatch from the Government of India dated March 25, 1890 (No. 70), written in the time of Lord Lansdowne and Lord Roberts, which puts the case in unexceptionable official language:

"The revenues of India have been charged with the cost of many changes in organisation not especially necessary for the efficiency of the army in this country, and with the cost of troops employed on Imperial service beyond the limits of India. Millions of money have been spent on increasing the army of India, on armaments, and on fortifications to provide for the security of India, not against domestic enemies or to prevent the incursions of the warlike people of adjoining countries, *but to maintain the supremacy of British power in the East*. [The italics are ours; but the words are the views of Anglo-Indian officials, in their saner moments, upon the true motives of the forward frontier policy.] The scope of all these great and costly measures [*e.g.*, Quetta, Chitral, Tirah] reaches far beyond Indian limits, and the policy which dictates them is an Imperial policy. . . . . In conclusion, it is imperative, in our opinion, that this long-standing question should be settled, and that the people of India, who have no voice in the matter, should not be able to complain that an excessive military tribute is demanded from the revenues of their country. . . ."

Wise and weighty words—not the utterance of some Congress-wallah, some "sedition-monger," but the deliberately expressed opinion of an Indian Viceroy (Unionist in politics) and of an Indian commander-in-chief. We turn to a consideration of the non-effective charges.

Under 4 George IV c. 71, the East India Company paid £60,000 a year in full discharge of all claims for retiring pay, pensions, etc., in respect of the forces of His Majesty serving in the East Indies. This Act was repealed in 1861, and there was fixed in lieu of this definite sum a capitation rate of £3 10s. on the strength in India—a rate which was continued until 1870. In the nine years, 1861-2 to 1869-70, the average payment by India on this account was for some 63,000 men £221,000. From April 1, 1870, it was agreed that each pension should be actuarially valued and that India should pay the proportion due for service rendered to the Indian Government. Needless to

say, this new arrangement involved the Indian Government in heavy additional expense. It is a noteworthy fact in the history of these financial adjustments that whenever anything was "agreed," it was always so much the worse for India. The new arrangement worked out profitably for England. Here it is shortly expressed:

Capitation rate for pensions,	1861-70,	£3 10 0
" " "	1870-76,	6 7 8
" " "	1876-83,	13 8 6

Now, although India is, according to some of her rulers, a very wealthy country, with perennial surpluses, these charges were so extremely heavy that the Indian Government fell behindhand with its payments, and on March 31, 1883, over £2,000,000 was owing by the Indian Government to the Imperial Exchequer. Thereupon our financial experts hit upon a splendid idea. By a change in the system of actuarial computation they nominally reduced the pension charges from nearly a million sterling to £36,000 in 1884-5. Of course, this was only momentary relief—a putting-off of the evil day—a piece of slight-of-hand in book-keeping, and nothing more. Already by 1894-5 the charge for pensions had grown to £430,000, and it is steadily increasing year by year. The point to note is that, whatever else has been charged, the fundamental financial basis agreed upon, by which India suffers, has not been changed, that it is only a question of a few more years before the amount payable in 1882-3 is again reached—and passed.

Here again, then, we seem to see the same sinister process at work—a continual increase of the amounts payable by India to England. The £60,000 of the Old East India Company becomes £221,000 in the early days of the Crown. Not satisfied with this England "agrees" to charge India a great deal more, till we get nearly a million in 1882-3. Then comes a financial juggle, the final result of which will be in all probability to exceed the million. At present the charge for pensions is something like half-a-million sterling, or more than double what it was before April 1, 1870, when one of those agreements which are made between wolves and lambs cast its blighting shadow over the course of Indian Finance. In a third article we shall show how in other and more miscellaneous matters this *leonina societas* works out to the injury of Indian financial interests.

THE LAW OF SEDITION.[1]

By E. H. Pickersgill, M.P.
Of the Inner Temple, Barrister-at-Law.

THE Press prosecutions in India, and the legislation which has followed, purporting to be based upon the intention of the Indian Legislature to bring the law of sedition in that country clearly into accord with the law in England, have had at least one wholesome effect in stimulating enquiry as to what the English law on this subject really is. As a useful aid in this controversy I can heartily recommend a little book which has just come to hand from Calcutta. The author is Mr. Chaudhuri, a graduate of Oxford University, and a barrister of the Inner Temple. The body of the book contains a clear and concise statement of the principles of the English law of sedition, broken up into short chapters, and this is followed by an appendix, which gives the corresponding law in India as it was, and also as it has been altered by recent legislation. The author cau-tically remarks that from the portion of the book in which he has described the leading principles of the law he has scrupulously excluded all allusions to the amending Acts, and to the proceedings in relation thereto, as being "of ephemeral interest and of no value except as showing what the law should not be." The pith of Mr. Chaudhuri's book is comprised in two very short propositions. The first of these propositions is that, according to English law, the matter charged as seditious must be calculated to produce the unlawful *use of force*. Upon the whole, and after careful consideration, I think that Mr. Chaudhuri has accurately stated the law as it has been laid down in practice in recent years in England by English judges to English juries. At the same time, I would not contend that the author's statement exactly corresponds with the letter of the law. There are some considerations which it seems to me that Mr. Chaudhuri should have brought out more prominently in his book. It is well to bear in mind that since the Reform Act of 1832 there have been very few trials for sedition, that Government has not cared (or perhaps I might say has not *dared*) to prosecute except in cases where the incriminated matter contained pretty clearly an appeal to force; and that a judge in laying down the law upon any subject has naturally in view the circumstances of the particular case, and is not anxious as a rule to decide more than is necessary. Considerations of this kind were expressed with admirable force by Lord Fitzgerald in the case of *R. v. Sullivan* in 1868:—

> If (he said) the law was carried out in the full strictness of its letter, it would materially interfere with the freedom of the Press. Hence a great deal depends upon the forbearance of the Government, the discretion of the judges, and, *above all, on the protection of the juries.*

The last words of this pregnant statement point out what is the paramount safeguard in England of the citizen who is charged with sedition—trial by jury. The consideration that this safeguard exists in England, while it is generally absent in India, led me in a recent article to demur to the proposition even that the laws of sedition *ought* to be identical in the two countries. In England, if the law of sedition is vague, it is corrected by the jury; but in India, where over the greater part of the country the jury system does not exist, a wise legislature would either dispense altogether with any law of sedition properly so-called, or at least would confine it within very narrow limits, and define it in precise and definite terms. But, however this may be, Mr. Chaudhuri's contention is well-founded, that although the law of sedition in England and India respectively has been settled by different processes, the principles on which it is based are the same. This was the view generally accepted up to a very recent period, and it is still maintained by the highest authorities. It is significant, however, that in the *Bangobasi* case it is nowhere stated that the law was interpreted in accordance with the English law, and in Tilak's case Mr. Justice Strachey expressly said: "I do not think that English cases can have any bearing in the matter." On the other hand, recent illustrations in a contrary sense are not wanting. Mr. Chaudhuri quotes the observation made by Lord Fitzgerald in *R. v. Sullivan*, that "sedition is a crime against society nearly allied to that of treason, and it *frequently precedes treason by a short interval.*" I think that Mr. Chaudhuri might have enforced his argument by comparing with Lord Fitzgerald's statement the very interesting remarks made by Mr. Justice Ranade in delivering judgment in November last as a member of the Bombay Full Bench when the monstrous sentences passed in the *Pratod* case by the Sessions Judge of Satara were reduced.

> To understand correctly the precise scope of Section 124A (he said) it is necessary to bear in mind that this section, together with Section 121A, was avowedly inserted in Chapter VI of the Code relating to offences against the State, with a view to fill up an inadvertent omission of a special provision for the punishment of the offence of *the previous abetment of rebellion*. In the words of Sir James Stephen, it was felt that as the causes which produce rebellion are wide, and spread over a long period, a wider definition of abetment in the case of rebellion was necessary than sufficed in the case of theft or murder.

Mr. Chaudhuri explains very clearly the historical reasons which led Sir James Stephen to include "an intention to bring the Government into hatred or contempt" in his definition of sedition given in his "Digest of the Criminal Law." But, as the author well points out, the Indian Government, which at this time of day has deliberately introduced similar words into the new Section 124A of the Penal Code, has "by a stroke of the pen thrown back the law of sedition as it existed two centuries ago." Mr. Chalmers's statement that the law has thus been merely expressed in clear terms in accord with the interpretation of the old law upon which the judges of the Calcutta, Bombay, and Allahabad courts had substantially agreed, is contrary to the facts. It is certain that, subsequently to Tilak's case, a full bench of the Bombay High Court restored to the term "disaffection" its old, established significance. I am sorry that Mr. Chaudhuri has not quoted the observations made upon this point by Mr. Justice Parsons, with whom Mr. Justice Ranade entirely and almost verbally concurred:—

> The word "disaffection" used in Section 124A (said the learned

[1] "The Principles of the Law of Sedition." By J. Chaudhuri, M.A. (Cal.) and B.A. (Oxon.), and of the Inner Temple, Esquire. Weekly Notes Printing Works, Calcutta. 1898.

judge) cannot be construed as meaning *an absence of or the contrary of affection or love*—that is to say, dislike or hatred—but is used in its special sense as signifying political alienation or discontent—that is to say, a feeling of disloyalty to the existing Government, which tends to a disposition not to obey, but to *resist and subvert the Government*.

It will be seen that this judgment not only upsets Mr. Justice Strachey's strange interpretation of Section 124A, but also is inconsistent even with Sir Comer Petheram's view, which Mr. Justice Strachey distorted.

The second of Mr. Chaudhuri's two principal propositions relates to *intent*. It is essential to the offence of sedition, he says, that the incriminated matter should be published with an intention to produce the use of force. It is clear that since the close of the great controversy which ended with the passing of Fox's famous Libel Act in 1792, the existence of some kind of bad intention on the part of the offender has been embodied in the description of the crime of sedition. The precise nature of that bad intention has varied at different periods, and is not yet (it may be) entirely free from vagueness. But I think that Mr. Chaudhuri's statement is substantially accurate in practice. A still more important consideration, however, remains—namely, how is this intention to be determined? Mr. Chalmers, in introducing his Bill into the Viceroy's Council, laid down the law as follows:

In England the intent is presumed from the natural meaning of the words themselves, without reference to the actual feelings of the person who used them. In other words, the law applies a purely objective test.

I must say that this statement of the English law seems to me very misleading, not to say disingenuous. Mr. Chalmers must be, or at all events ought to be, perfectly familiar with the *Trafalgar Square* case (*R. v. Burns and others*) which has come to be regarded as a leading authority. And in that case Mr. Justice Cave charged the jury as follows:

In order to make out the offence of speaking seditious words, they must be words spoken with a seditious intent: and although it is a good working rule to say that a man must be taken to intend the natural consequences of his acts, and it is very proper to ask a jury to infer, if there is nothing to show the contrary, that he did intend the natural consequences of his acts, yet, if it is shown from other circumstances that he did not actually intend them, I do not see how you can ask a jury to act on what has become a legal fiction.

In the appendix to his book the author comments very forcibly on the new Section 153A, which makes the promotion of feelings of enmity between classes in itself an offence irrespective of an intent to disturb public tranquillity. He points out that Chapter XV of the Penal Code deals with acts which are more likely than anything else to create ill-will between classes, namely, offences relating to religion. In every section in this chapter, however, *intent* is made the essence of the offence; and yet, notwithstanding this precaution, Mr. Mayne in his Commentary describes these sections as "dangerous" in their character. It seems to me worth while to draw special attention to the *Explanation* which is appended to this section. It runs as follows:

It does not amount to an offence within the meaning of the section to *point out*, without malicious intention, and with an honest view to their removal, matters which are producing, or have a tendency to produce feelings of enmity or hatred between different classes of her Majesty's subjects.

Mr. Chaudhuri's criticism appears to be well founded, that but for this explanation even acts arising out of an honest and well-intentioned desire to *remove* ill-feeling between classes might have been construed into an offence. The use of the expression "to point out" is also very remarkable. The implication may be that if anybody ventures to express his opinion or criticise, he must do so at his risk.

The author also takes strong exception to the new section which empowers magistrates to take security for good behaviour from persons disseminating seditious matter. In the first place, as is pointed out, any mischief which may be properly apprehended is sufficiently met by Section 107 of the Code of Criminal Procedure which enables a magistrate to take security in case of acts likely to cause a breach of the peace. The new section, on the other hand, far transcends the sound principles which were laid down in an Irish case by Lord Chief Justice May in 1883 as the proper limit of this kind of jurisdiction:—

Where (he said) a person has *incited others to a violation of law and of right*, and there is reasonable *ground to believe that the delinquent is likely to persevere in that course*, a Justice of the Peace has authority by law, in the execution of preventive justice, to provide for the public security by requiring the individual to give sureties for good behaviour, and in default commit him to prison. It is a wide judicial discretionary power *to be exercised with great caution* and not capriciously, and *to be jealously watched over by this court*.

THE STRANGE CASE OF THE KHOTS.

An extraordinary story comes to us from the Bombay Presidency. In the Konkan division, along the west coast north of Bombay, are the districts of Ratnagiri and Colaba. In these two districts there are a class of people designated Khots, for whose benefit—if benefit it be—the Government passed the Khoti Act, I of 1880. The position of a Khot is this: he is a village-holder, drawing in certain rents from the village cultivators, and responsible to Government for the general village assessment. The principle of the method is a very common one in India, under whatever variety or designation, and the working of it is, or ought to be, simplicity itself. Now, the Khot's assessment, payable to Government, is fixed by the survey officials, and sanctioned by Government; and the rents of the individual cultivators of the village, payable to the Khot, are fixed by the settlement officer. The Khot is rewarded for his trouble by the surplus—if any—that remains in his hands after he has paid the Government assessment. It might puzzle the very spirit of mischief to devise a hitch in this arrangement.

So much for the Khots in general. Let us now go to the particular Khots of the Devgad taluka of the Ratnagiri district. In 1891, there took place a revision of the assessment of the Khots of this taluka. The result was a considerable enhancement of the assessment on the villages. The cultivators' rents, however, were not revised. They remained just as they had been before. The upshot was that many of the Khots discovered that the payment of their new Government assessment not only left them with barer pockets, not only absorbed the whole of the rents they were legally entitled to collect, but actually required them to dip into their private patrimony to supplement the deficiency. "The situation," says one of our correspondents, "is so absurd that it would be difficult indeed to imagine that it could have arisen under the British Government. But there it is." For ourselves, we have only two remarks to make, in the meantime. First, the thing seems incredible. Second, is it nevertheless true?

Well, for one thing, we have before us an elaborate, earnest, and respectful Petition addressed by "Khots of villages in the Devgad Taluka of the Ratnagiri District" to "His Excellency the Right Honourable George Robert Canning, Baron Harris, G.C.I.E., Governor and President in Council, Bombay," and dated "February, 1893." That is just *five years ago*. The petition explains the whole difficulty, with selected details in illustration, and the petitioners pray his Excellency in Council "to institute a thorough search in the great injustice that has been done to them," and to redress their grievances "either by revising the rents or by reducing the assessment or by both, in any manner which to your Excellency in Council may seem meet." So far, good. This petition alleging an obvious and gross injustice—an injustice that could never have arisen without the grossest negligence on the part of the Government officials—appears to have been acknowledged by the Collector of Ratnagiri, under instructions from the Government, on January 30, 1895; that is, *two years* almost to a day *after its date*. The Government resolution on the subject is "dated January 4, 1895," so that the blame for the outrageous delay does not lie with the Collector, but with the Bombay Government. The question arises at once, and it will not be repressed: what do Englishmen at home think of this sample of Government modes of doing the business of government in Bombay? They have the praises of our Indian administration steadily dinned into their ears, till they are apparently incapacitated for any attitude but that of blank admiration. What do they say to this? Two whole years before the miserable petitioner can obtain from Government even the courtesy of an acknowledgment.

But this is not the whole case. Let us see the answer. We quote it textually from *Native Opinion* of February 3, 1895:—

Government admit that the combined effect of the new rates and the fixing of the rents by the Khoti Settlement Officer is to make the

holding of a Khoti village a source of loss in some instances to the Khots. As the law at present stands Government have no power to interfere, but the possibility of providing by legislation for the adjustment of rents with fairness both to the Khots and the tenants . . . is under the consideration of Government.

"Government *admit*." Government limit the admission to "some" instances. But the petition sets out numerous instances, and very serious instances, and these instances are only samples—"only a few instances," the petition says, out of many. "There are about 80 villages held by Khots in Devgad Taluka," says a correspondent, "and the condition is the same in most of them." Then the Government having "no power to interfere," has "under consideration"—what?—"the possibility of providing by legislation" for a fair adjustment, the existing conditions being admittedly not "fair." Before proceeding to enquire what this consideration of a possibility has come to, let us further state that a second point of complaint in the petition was, "that in numerous cases the Khoti Settlement Officer has recorded no rents." "Recorded *no* rents"! Is the man asleep, or is he on a long journey? Well, this is the official answer:—

The omission of the Khoti Settlement officer to record rent in all cases has apparently arisen from the difficulty of doing so consistently with the provisions of the existing law on the subject. Cases in which no rent has been recorded can, however, be dealt with on occasion arising by the grant of assistance to the Khot on application in recovering such rent as in all the circumstances of the case shall appear just and reasonable under Section 83 of the Land Revenue Code.

Here is a full admission of the petitioners' case on this point, and a roundabout means of redress. But what sort of legislative machine have they got in Bombay to turn out an Act which has to be officially confessed to be unworkable? It is an extraordinary revelation of incompetence. But to return to the fruits of the Bombay Government's "consideration" of the "possibility of providing by legislation for a fair adjustment" of those ridiculous rent matters. Will it be believed in England that the Bombay Government is still solemnly engaged in "consideration," and has not yet discovered the "possibility of providing by legislation" for a simple adjustment of rents in circumstances that are glaringly and admittedly unfair? Will it be believed in England that when "questions were put in the Legislative Council"—no doubt by some presumptuous and inconsiderate Indian member—"asking whether, pending any legislative remedy, Government will be pleased not to take from the Khotis the enhanced assessment," the answer was a decided negative? What vestige of moral right has the Government to a single pie of the Khot's money beyond his income from the rents? From time to time, also, questions have been put implying the urgency of an early solution of the difficulty. But nothing whatever appears to have been done. "Strange to say," writes a correspondent, "as yet the situation has not been remedied at all, and some of the villages are now in attachment. I refrain from comment." But will the English Press refrain from comment? We are now exactly *five years* from the date of the petition, and the whole district remains harassed, aggrieved, and resentful. We are hurt, too, if any symptom of disloyalty or restlessness manifests itself. And once more, and finally, according to Balfour's "Cyclopædia," "the Southern Konkan has always been the great recruiting ground of the Bombay army." Could the force of futility—even official futility—further go?

"REPRESENTATIVE INDIANS."[1]

WE have nothing but sympathy and commendation for Mr. Pillai's endeavour to commemorate "the best representatives of a new type of men who have been brought into existence in India since the growth of British power in that land." Such a memorial, if it were well carried out, would have several uses. It would, in the first place, be a just and pious tribute to services rendered to humanity. It would be a stimulus to other Indians to follow the examples commemorated. It would help the Englishman to understand and appreciate the leaders of thought and action amongst his fellow-subjects; it would remove some barriers of old prejudice and open up some new channels of sympathy.

[1] "Representative Indians." By G. Paramaswaran Pillai, B.A. London: George Routledge and Sons.

This was the comfortable anticipation with which the present reviewer read Mr. Pillai's preface. He must confess that the after-reading of the book brought a feeling of disappointment, and revived the recollection of a satire of Jean Ingelow's read long ago in childhood. How that satire "The Biography of Mr. John Smith," came to be incorporated in a book of children's stories the reviewer does not know. But he remembers vividly the boredom of reading that "In this year Mr. John Smith invented a patent poker and subscribed ten pounds to the Charing Cross Hospital," and the resentment roused in his mind, at the mature age of seven, by the conclusion of the narrative: "And is this all? asks the ignorant reader. Yes, it is all. But will *your* life contain anything more worthy of remembrance? Anyhow, the honour of recording it is not solicited by your obedient servant, the biographer of Mr. John Smith." The invention of the patent poker and the donation of ten pounds to the Charing Cross Hospital may be paralleled again and again from Mr. Pillai's well-meant biographies. "In his capacity as Chairman he had the honour of requesting Sir Richard Temple to open the Tulsi Water-works, and was presented with a silver and ivory hammer as a memento of the occasion" (p. 260). "It was often remarked that there were two men who, by their inspiring presence, dignified manners and edifying conversation, made the Cosmopolitan Club genial and attractive" (p. 216). The reader is wearied by repeated trivialities like these; and it is seldom that he is consoled by so excellent a piece of unconscious humour as the concluding sentences of the volume. An astounding anti-climax, one would naturally call them, for a series of biographies of great men; but so much has preceded not a whit more important that no anti-climax is felt.

It is admitted on all hands that Sir Salar Jung was a remarkable man. Sir Monier Williams, during one of his visits to India, met Sir Salar Jung as well as Sir Madava Rao, and in his "Modern India," he admits, "India is not likely to produce two such men as Sir Salar Jung and Sir Madava Rao more than once in two or three centuries. I conversed with both these great ministers, not long since, in their own houses (one at Hyderabad, and the other at Baroda), and found them capable of talking on all snbjects in as good English as my own."

The idea that the greatness of India's greatest men is to be measured by their ability to talk as good English as Sir Monier Williams is distinctly funny. Or was Sir Monier Williams thinking with natural, if excessive, pride of the superiority of his own English to Sir Richard Temple's? It is difficult to believe that Sir Richard delivered the speech attributed to him on p. 231. Surely some of the idioms are due to a reporter. Yet this volume appears with a recommendatory introduction from Sir Richard, who must be supposed to have had an opportunity of revising its contents.

Be this as it may, Sir R. Temple's introduction constitutes, with the author's preface, the most valuable and interesting part of the book. He takes the record of the volume as evidence that "notwithstanding the dominion of foreigners, there have arisen within the last three generations many Natives in all the principal provinces who have evinced mental power and imaginative genius, and who have vigorously displayed their abilities before their countrymen with an intention and a confidence of producing a public result." He proceeds to point out some of the lines along which these abilities have developed. There has been a great growth of literary culture. Secondly, there has arisen a valuable class of Native administrators. Thirdly, the best and ablest Natives have exerted themselves strenuously "for moral improvement, for intellectual freedom, for social reform"; they have always "vindicated a lofty and sincere morality," and in religion have wished to revert to "the purer and simpler forms of the ancient Hindu faith." Lastly, fixity and tenacity of purpose are shown to be characteristic of Indians as well as of Britons.

All this is true and is very valuable. But it makes one regret the more that this useful impression should be obscured by so many trivial details. Mr. Pillai occupies himself too much with the externals of a life. He does not take us—though he would seem to imagine that he does (p. 242)—to the springs and motives. Only rarely does a vivid story give us a glimpse of the real man, and then it is not always a pleasant glimpse. The story of the boy Runganada rushing from his seat on the occasion of a school anniversary to present his unsuccessful essay to the Governor and get it reconsidered for a prize does not

conciliate admiration. On the whole, the book is an example, and a not very favourable example, of the species of literature chiefly associated in England with the name of Sir Samuel Smiles. It shows that success, under a reasonably just Government, waits upon perseverance, talent and probity. It does not show that the real life of a man is something that goes deeper and further than these obvious virtues, and that very different qualities are needed to make a man truly great. Mr. Pillai may, perhaps, reply that he *has* attributed other qualities to his heroes. But the point is that he does not make them *real* to the reader. The piling up of complimentary epithets leaves us cold and unconvinced. Nay, like the Athenian of old, we grow weary of hearing Aristides called "the Just."

However, until something more adequate is written, Mr. Pillai's volume will serve as a useful summary of the careers of the most notable Indians of the nineteenth century. It includes statesmen like Sir Salar Jung, Sir Dinkar Rao, and Sir Madava Rao; philanthropists like Sir Jamsetji Jijibhai; jurists like Mitter, Telang, and Mandlik; scholars like Mudaliar and Gopal Rao; religious reformers like Rammohan Roy and Keshub Chunder Sen; social reformers like Vidyasagar and Kursendas, and political reformers like Ram Gopal Ghose, Chetti, and Naoroji Furdunji. There are thirty-six lives in all, and though the living are excluded from the plan, two who died as lately as 1896 are admitted. Much care has evidently been bestowed upon the details; and if the result is somewhat disappointing, it is only just to remember that Mr. Pillai is a pioneer worker in the field of Native biography.

To say all this is, of course, to estimate Mr. Pillai's work by reference to a high standard. So doing we have done, we think, what the character of the book requires, for its aim is clearly more ambitious than the aim of a mere summary or volume of reference. But we cordially recognise the many merits of Mr. Pillai's work. Undoubtedly his book "supplies a want," and will serve a most useful purpose. It was highly important that some account of typical representatives of modern India should be placed in a connected form within reach of the general reader. Mr. Pillai has endeavoured to discharge this task, and his book is in its own way a most careful and conscientious piece of work.

THE WEEK IN PARLIAMENT.

BY OUR OWN ONLOOKER.

It is customary when we reach the Easter recess to refer to it as a "breathing-space," and to take the opportunity of summing up the first part of the Session. The word "breathing-space" implies that there has been something of the nature of a rush, and I think it is even more than usually inappropriate with regard to this Session. It is impossible to imagine anything more deliberately jog-trot as regards pace than what is known as "progress" so far. At the same time there are points worthy of comment as regards both what has been done and what has been left undone.

Nothing has been more striking than the weariness, nay, almost the stupor, which has overtaken Parliament. I believe it is the effect of what may be termed a huge and hulking majority. Seldom if ever has there been such a large majority, and never have there been such empty benches. One is accustomed to see this lassitude and indifference in the last year of a Parliament, but we are given to understand that this Parliament is middle-aged. I may add, too, that one has been accustomed to see empty benches when Indian topics are discussed, for a good many Englishmen are content to show their interest in India merely by referring to it, in a peroration, as the brightest jewel in the British Crown, and then passing on. But this beggarly array of empty benches has been on view on nearly all occasions. Millions of money have been voted in the most happy-go-lucky style, members being unable or unwilling to do more than yawn. I am not joking, but stating a sober fact when I say that nothing, after the debate on the Address had ended, has attracted so much attention as the "O" and "Mac" Bill of Mr. Macaleese. The House regarded it as a bit of comic relief, and therefore tackled it with zest. Anything more serious they regard as a bore, or beyond their capacity—and I am not sure that some of them are not right in the second view.

It would be absurd to talk about new reputations. Mr. Curzon has attracted more attention than any other member. But that has been because he has succeeded in not answering a great many questions. He has made quite a record as regards the policy of the shut mouth. In Sir Ellis Ashmead-Bartlett we have the extreme of an antithesis, for he has run the policy of the wide-open mouth to excess. I don't think he has managed to get any one of his numerous questions really and fully answered. He has, however, succeeded in an even more desperate enterprise, for he has broken the record of his own absurdity. Mr. Chamberlain has not had many chances, but he has made the most of them, his game being to impress the country with the notion that he is a "strong" Minister, in contradistinction to Lord Salisbury's "flabbiness" in foreign policy. There are no others who need be noticed. Mr. Balfour has been himself—neither his good points nor his bad have been increased or diminished.

I have referred to the non-answering of questions, and even in a little informal and skimming review of this sort I cannot overlook the outburst about the suppression of questions by the clerks at the Table. That is perhaps the most healthy sign of the Session so far. It shows at least that the members do take an interest in something. If you tread on their corns they show resentment, and this argues life.

It is only fair, too, to acknowledge that last Friday night the Government took the right line over the Telephone debate. Somehow or other we have been victimised by the National Telephone Company. Sir James Fergusson, during the last hour or two of his tenure of office as Postmaster-General in 1892, signed an agreement on behalf of the Post Office with the National Telephone Company, and very soon after he blossomed forth as a director of that Company. Our telephone system has been the laughing-stock of the world. Little villages in Australia and all over the Continent are far ahead of London in this respect. Nay, even the Isle of Man mocks us.

The municipalities therefore want to take the matter in hand on their own account, having hitherto been prevented by the Post Office's preservation of the monopoly to the National Telephone Company, the pet property, as I have said, of Sir James Fergusson, who has been known at the India Office as well as in Bombay. Now the Government has thrown over its unpopular friend, and not only will municipalities be allowed to establish systems, but the Post Office itself means to compete actively. A proposal that the State should buy up the Telephone Company was very properly knocked on the head. It is just what the Company wants—but just what would have wrecked the Government had it been allowed.

On Monday there were many instances of stupid officialism brought before the House in connexion with the Prisons Bill, which was read a second time. John Burns made a really powerful speech, speaking as one who has suffered imprisonment, and with all his fervour and passion he managed to keep his head. But the most glaring instance of officialism was brought forward during questions by Mr. W. Redmond. It seems that some stupid martinet in the navy has sent a decent gunner, who had a good conduct badge, to the cells for fourteen days for wearing a bit of shamrock on St. Patrick's Day. The man also loses his good conduct badge and is reduced to the second class! It is almost impossible to deal adequately in print with such a piece of stupid iniquitous officialism. Mr. W. Redmond got so angry that he defied the Speaker and was removed. This may or may not be wise. But it is high time that these outrageous scandals were stopped. I saw on St. Patrick's Day the Solicitor-General for Ireland and Lord Charles Beresford, who is a Rear-Admiral, wearing the shamrock in the House, and I know that the Lord Lieutenant wore it too. Mr. Goschen's "explanation" that the man was not punished for wearing it, but for refusing to remove it, was simply ludicrous. It is not surprising that there is a difficulty in getting men for the navy. The wonder is we get so many.

Tuesday's debate on our policy (if any) in the Far East, as to which expectations had been so much raised, was rather disappointing after all. Mr. Balfour seemed "to feel his position acutely," if I may use a phrase sometimes applied to police-court proceedings. It is obvious that nothing like a summary of a debate which lasted for hours can be attempted here. I will therefore just say in a word what struck me chiefly in its course. First of all stands out the fine tone and ability of Sir Edward Grey's speech—which was the more striking and welcome because Mr. Curzon had distinctly failed for once. Next I was impressed by the terribly destructive criticism of Sir Charles Dilke. His questions were so keen and searching as to lead Mr. Curzon into a querulous little outburst. For instance, it had been said that the Chinese have promised not to cede the Yangtse Valley to any other Power. Sir Charles Dilke asked if we were prepared to fight supposing that some Power brought pressure on China, and if we were not upon what could we rely to preserve this region to China? Mr. Curzon answered in absurdly stilted style, "Upon the common sense of British Governments and upon the patriotism of the British people"! It reminded me of Disraeli's celebrated answer when he was asked for the policy of his party. "We mean to rely on the sublime instincts of an ancient people!" Again, there was a strange contradiction between Mr. Curzon and Mr. Balfour as to whether we suppose Wei-hai-wei balances Port Arthur. Mr. Balfour says "Yes," and Mr. Curzon says "No." But the most amazing of all is that it was not until March 22 that the Government says it learnt from Pekin that Russia had designs upon Port Arthur. Mr. Curzon said something the other day about journalists showing an intelligent

anticipation of facts before they occur. That certainly cannot be said of some statesmen. The one important question asked on Tuesday is, What are we going to do with Wei-hai-wei? The Government did not say, and I expect for the good reason that it does not know. The holiday will give a much-needed opportunity for reflection.

CHRONICLE OF THE WEEK.

THURSDAY, March 31.—The result of the poll in the Wokingham division was declared. Commander Young, the Conservative candidate, was elected by 4,726 votes against 3,690 given to Mr. Palmer, a majority of 1,036. At the last contest for the division the Conservative majority was 2,248.

The German and Austrian journals were unanimous in describing the Russo-Chinese agreement as a complete defeat for the diplomacy of Great Britain, and a severe blow to her prestige in Asia. A British naval demonstration was to be organised in the Gulf of Pechili, though with what object did not appear.

From Madrid it was reported that the proposals of the United States Government with regard to Cuba—the immediate proclamation of an armistice to last till October, during which time the United States would use their good offices for a permanent peace, and active measures by Spain to relieve the Reconcentrados in the island, the United States being permitted to assist in the work—were under consideration at a Cabinet Council, and a final conference with the American Minister was to take place in the afternoon. President M'Kinley had informed the leaders of Congress that a definite result of his negotiations was expected on the following day.

Mr. Gladstone went out of doors again, and the bulletin stated that his increased comfort continued. An expression of solicitude was received from the Italian Senate.

A statement was issued from the Treasury showing the total revenue of the United Kingdom for the year which closed to-day. The total reached the immense sum of £116,016,314. For the preceding year the total was £112,198,547, so that the last year showed an increase of £3,817,767. Of the total revenue £106,614,004 was paid into the Exchequer, and £9,402,310 to local taxation accounts. The Chancellor of the Exchequer in his Budget statement in April last year estimated his revenue for the year at £103,360,000, against an estimated expenditure of £101,790,000. There was an increase under each main head of revenue with the exception of "miscellaneous," the decrease under which was only a little over £300,000. For the quarter which ended to-day the total revenue was £38,650,194, compared with £37,210,901 in the corresponding quarter of last year.

FRIDAY, April 1.—It was stated from Madrid that Señor Sagasta himself drew up the reply handed to General Woodford, in which the Spanish Government rejected the American pretensions regarding Cuba, and cast upon the United States the responsibility of persisting in the course foreshadowed by General Woodford. In was stated that the Spanish reply contends that it was for the Insurgents, and not the United States, to ask for an armistice, and that the proposal for an armistice should be dealt with by the autonomous Cabinet of Cuba. According to another source, Spain had definitely resolved to make no more concessions. On the receipt in Washington of General Woodford's telegram conveying the substance of the Spanish reply, President M'Kinley decided that further action in the matter must be deferred till Monday. Those who visited Mr. M'Kinley to-day stated that Spain's reply had disappointed his expectations.

Several British warships in the Far East arrived at Chefoo, others were at Shanghai, and one was in the Yangtse-kiang.

There was much activity in "Government circles." The French Ambassador spent a long time at the Foreign Office, the other callers including the Russian, Austrian, Spanish, and United States representatives. The German Ambassador had a lengthy interview with Mr. Chamberlain at the Colonial Office. Despatches arrived from Lord Salisbury, whose health, it appeared, had much improved.

Arthur Orton, the notorious Claimant to the Tichborne estates, died suddenly, at an apartment in Marylebone, where he had been living for the past two months with his second wife. The cause of death was certified to be syncope. He was about sixty-nine years of age.

SATURDAY, April 2.—The situation in regard to the dispute between the United States and Spain had undergone no change. The position appeared to hinge upon President M'Kinley's Message to Congress, which was not to be presented, according to present advices, until Tuesday. Meanwhile great uneasiness prevailed on both sides of the Atlantic. Hostile preparations were actively being carried out, and every preparation was set on foot for war, while at the same time every desire was expressed for peace. The excitement in Spain was intense.

Along with a report from Pekin of a visit paid by the British Minister to the Tsung-li-Yamen, it was stated that Great Britain had demanded "important concessions" as compensation for those given to other Powers and for the maintenance of "the balance of power in the Far East." This was explained in a later telegram to mean the lease of Wei-hai-wei upon its evacuation by Japan.

Mr. Cecil Rhodes arrived at Plymouth in the "Tantallon Castle." The results of the latest elections at the Cape were handed to him, and he expressed great pleasure at the news. Dr. Rutherfoord Harris, who accompanied him, declared, in the course of an interview, that the results "undoubtedly meant the return of Mr. Rhodes to power at the Cape."

In a speech at Sheffield Mr. Barnes, general secretary of the Amalgamated Society of Engineers, said that last year the men, believing a lock-out was inevitable, thought they might as well have it on the eight-hours day as on any other question. They had now accepted the employers' terms, and they would work fairly and squarely, but at the same time they intended to improve the terms as fast as they possibly could. They had lost the immediate object they had in view last year, but they had not done with it yet.

Official correspondence on the subject of the evils connected with opium smoking in India and the recommendations of the Royal Commission thereon was issued. The Government of India concluded a despatch by saying they agreed with the great majority of the local governments that it was undesirable at present to undertake penal legislation against opium smoking in saloons and clubs. Lord George Hamilton said he concurred in the conclusions of the Indian Government.

SUNDAY, April 3.—More favourable bulletins were issued from Hawarden Castle to-day and on Saturday. On Saturday Mr. Gladstone did not complain of pain. He had a "pretty good night," and this afternoon he was able to go out of doors and sit in the garden during the sunshine.

MONDAY, April 4.—A Cabinet Council was held at the Foreign Office.

A Reuter despatch from Pekin said that the Tsung-li-Yamen officially announced the opening to trade of three ports—Funing, on the Sam Sa inlet, Yo-chau, at the head of the Tung-ting Lake, and Chinwang, on the Gulf of Leao-tong. —The British battleship "Barfleur," the cruisers "Powerful," "Grafton," "Edgar," "Undaunted," "Pique," "Iphigenia," and "Rainbow," with two sloops and a gunboat, were now at Chefoo, and more vessels of the British squadron were expected.—It was reported from Yokohama that at a Council of the Japanese Cabinet held on Saturday it was decided to pursue a passive policy, refraining from action in the present crisis.—The Pekin Correspondent of the *Times* said there were indications of a possible French movement for the acquisition of a coaling-station at the mouth of the Min river. The French in the Far East were dissatisfied on account of the disproportion of the advantages gained by Russia compared with those secured by France.—The news of the concession of Wei-hai-wei to Great Britain came as a complete surprise to the Germans, but their Press seemed on the whole inclined to regard it with favour, as placing a buffer between the Russian and German spheres of interest. It was feared, however, that the commercial importance of Kiao-Chow would suffer owing to the close proximity of British competition.

Statements made in Madrid and elsewhere that the Pope had definitely offered to mediate between the United States and Spain, and that his mediation had been practically accepted by the Spanish Government, were contradicted in some quarters, and there seemed to be some uncertainty as to the real nature of his Holiness's proposal.—The tone of both Houses of Congress in Washington was very warlike, and there was agitation to bring the "Maine" disaster again to the front, and also against Papal mediation. It was understood, however, that the President would not address any Message to Congress before Wednesday, and it was believed that Congress would wait till then.

TUESDAY, April 5.—The Pekin correspondent of the *Times* said that China had agreed to the French demands, which comprised the non-alienation of any part of Kwang-tung, Kwang-si, and Yun-nan, the construction of a railway to Yun-nan-fu, the lease of a coaling-station, and the appointment of a Frenchman as Director of the Imperial Post. British rights respecting the extension at Kaulung would be respected. It was stated that M. Pavloff, the Russian Chargé d'Affairs in Pekin, had a long interview on Monday with Sir Claude MacDonald. The continental journals commented freely on the British acquisition of Wei-hai-wei, generally regarding it as a natural outcome of the Russian policy. Some of the Russian newspapers, however, took an angry tone, and complained of the measure as hostile to Russia.

It was stated that the Government of Natal had notified the Colonial Office that it was prepared to supply, free of cost, 12,000 tons of steam coal annually to ships of her Majesty's navy calling at the Port of Durban. Mr. Chamberlain had replied stating that her Majesty's Government were very much gratified with the generous offer of the Natal Government, and that the Admiralty would be glad to avail themselves of the offer as far as possible.

The New York correspondent said that President M'Kinley's Message was completed and read to the Cabinet. It was to be sent to Congress on Wednesday. In the meantime the war

party in Congress was doing its utmost to make the Houses act before the Message was received, and there were violent jingo speeches in the Senate.

The *London Gazette* published General Sir W. Lockhart's despatches on the operations of the Tirah expedition.

THE NEW LAW OF SEDITION.

THE POSITION OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The following letter from Sir W. Wedderburn, M.P., appeared in the *Daily Chronicle* of March 31:

THE EDITOR OF THE "DAILY CHRONICLE."

SIR,—In the debate of the 18th ult., on Mr. Herbert Roberts's amendment regarding the new sedition laws for India, Lord George Hamilton, confirmed by the Attorney-General, assured the House of Commons that the changes proposed merely put existing provisions into plain and unambiguous language, and that the law was practically unaltered. We have now before us the full proceedings of the Legislative Council at Calcutta, as officially reported in the *Gazette of India*, and it is manifest that the above statement of the facts is altogether incorrect. So far from the law being practically unaltered, it is clear that a deadly blow has been struck at freedom of speech and the liberty of the Press; and this opinion is held by all classes, European and Native, of the non-official public in India.

Within the limits of a letter I cannot set forth all the particulars, but perhaps you will allow me to quote an extract from the protest recorded by the Calcutta Bar against two particularly objectionable innovations, which (1) allow district magistrates to try political cases in which they are themselves complainants, and (2) empower them to require from editors security for good behaviour, under the chapter relating to vagrants, suspected persons, and habitual offenders. This is what the Calcutta Bar, including such men as Sir Charles Paul, Mr. Pugh, Mr. Jackson, Mr. Bonnerjee, and Mr. Garth, say with regard to the first point: "The district magistrate is the executive head of his district and the official representative of the Government in recommending and undertaking the prosecution of political offences. The trial of such offences should, therefore, not be in his court, nor in that of any magistrate, however specially empowered, who is subordinate to him. An inevitable inference will be drawn from a proposal which places the trial of political offenders in the hands of the executive authority; and it is not an inference which should be encouraged, for the executive tendencies of many of the judicial tribunals in the Mofussil are already markedly apparent. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that a sessions judge is assisted by jurymen or assessors, whose knowledge of the vernacular in these cases is most material in determining the true significance of the alleged seditious article, and its probable effect upon the people. It is in the interests of justice that the Bar urge that cases of this kind should invariably and exclusively be tried by a High Court or a Sessions Court, with the aid of a jury or assessors." As regards the second point, the Bar "strongly protest" against the proposed power to require from editors security for good behaviour. "In effect, all newspapers will be placed under the complete control of the district magistrates, or those magistrates specially empowered in that behalf; that is to say, of the very persons whose action, by virtue of their public position, and the very wide powers they enjoy, are likely to meet with disapproval and to be the subject of strong criticism at the hands of the Press; and who, therefore, will be the most intolerant of such criticism, and the most inclined to be prejudiced." It is self-evident that the effect of such provisions will be to coerce the Indian Press, and to deprive it of all independence.

How, then, does the case now stand as regards the House of Commons? It stands thus: Mr. Herbert Roberts's amendment was rejected on the assurance of the principal law officer of the Crown that the changes proposed "certainly had not the intention, nor would they have the effect, of curtailing or interfering with the liberty of the Press." But the assurance thus given has been falsified by the terms of the Acts which have now been passed. The Government are therefore bound in common honesty to withhold sanction to these Acts until the House of Commons has had an opportunity of revising its previous decision, which was arrived at upon an incorrect statement of the facts. I have, etc.,

House of Commons, March 28. W. WEDDERBURN.

THE INDIAN BUDGET.

OPINIONS OF THE BRITISH PRESS.

THE "INVESTORS' REVIEW."

In an article headed "A Romantic Indian Budget," the *Investors' Review* (edited by Mr. A. J. Wilson), wrote:—

Telegraphic advices for some time back have been preparing the British public for an optimistic Budget statement. It has now made its appearance, and deserves to be carefully studied by the public-spirited citizens of the United Kingdom. In the Viceroy's summary of it we are informed that the deficit for the year closing on the 31st inst. will be 52,800,000 rupees, or about 30,000,000 more than the estimate put forward a year ago. This deficiency is accounted for by the cost of famine relief, which is put at almost 54,000,000 rupees, and the war expenditure of 36,400,000 rupees, not estimated at all in the Budget of March last. The famine expenditure is about 18,000,000 rupees larger than the first estimate, but the final general result will apparently be about 7,000,000 rupees better than the estimate of December last, owing to savings by a propped-up exchange, and the postponement of railway expenditure. Several sources of revenue are better than the estimates to the amount of 7,600,000 rupees, but the opium revenue fell off 5,700,000 rupees. It is impossible to say how far the figures may have been "adjusted" to produce this result. Even when we receive the full budget minute this may not be possible, so we may leave this statement as it stands, and turn to the Budget for the coming year, merely with the remark that if the famine has cost so little and involved so little loss of income, as Sir James Westland says, it is the cheapest calamity of the kind India has ever known. And the same statement applies to the cost of the frontier war. We believe neither. According to the telegram, the surplus estimated in the new Budget to accrue at the end of March, 1899, will be 8,900,000 rupees. We shall be delighted to congratulate the Government of India should that hope be realised, and it may be if India continues to borrow well. Only 105,700,000 rupees was spent from capital account by the State and company railways during the year now at its close, but the expenditure for the coming year is to be raised to 132,000,000 rupees, making about 238,000,000 rupees for the two years. As all this money will have in some way or other to be borrowed, it is easy to see that considerable stimulus will thus be given to the resources of the Government. In the meantime, a loan of £6,000,000 sterling, £2,640,000 of which represents new money, is to be raised in this country, and in addition a rupee loan for 30,000,000 is to be emitted in India, making together, say, £4,500,000 net to be added to the debt of the Indian Government during the coming year. Over and above this, we presume that the moneys to be raised by the various railway companies in pursuance of their policy of extension will also afford relief. The floating debt of £6,000,000 now outstanding in London is to be renewed, but no mention appears to be made of the six or seven millions sterling shortage on this year's Council drawings.

It will be noticed that, apart from the application of the blind eye to inconvenient unliquidated accounts, the whole question of the outcome of the Budget turns upon the rate of exchange. It appears that the rate realised on remittances made during the present year has been about 1s. 3⅜d. per rupee, and the Budget estimates are based upon the same average for the coming year. But, as has just been mentioned, about £7,000,000 of the Simla Government's English obligations were not drawn for this year at all. In the coming year they are to be drawn for to the full, or the admitted full. At least, so we gather from the announcement that the total of the drawings is to be £16,000,000. This, we presume, does not cover "stores," but represents merely the net obligations of the Government of India on its public debt, railway annuities, army charges, and so on. We are not, indeed, certain that £16,000,000 anything like covers all these, but for the present accept the statement as it stands, merely remarking that the Home charges on account of the army of India amounted in 1895-96 to fully £3,000,000, whereas the effective army charges set down in the Budget of March last as payable in England was little more than £1,000,000. As these charges steadily expand we do not see how the money required to pay them can be a diminishing amount.

The important question, however, which is to be now discussed is the capacity of the Indian trade to bear the full £16,000,000, which will mean a payment out of the Indian treasuries of about 280,000,000 of rupees on the Government's own adopted exchange. Now, as we pointed out some weeks ago, the margin in the value of Indian exports over imports is frequently below this total, and tends to fall further below it the more Indian trade becomes hampered by an artificial exchange. In 1896-97 it fell to rather less than 240,000,000 of rupees, but take it at 370,000,000, which was the margin shown in favour of India by the trade of 1894-95, and still the full weight of the Indian Government Home charges is more than this trade can bear. For we must never forget that there are a variety of other remittances from India which must be taken into account in any estimate of its true economic position. A few weeks ago we summarised these, and, for the twentieth time or so, repeated the estimate that the aggregate of all charges, private and State, to be met every year in England out of the surplus exports of Indian produce could not be less than £30,000,000, or between 450,000,000 and 500,000,000 rupees, according as the exchange value of the rupee fluctuates. The foreign trade of India has not borne half this charge for any three years running this generation back. In that of the ten years between 1887-8 and 1896-7 inclusive, the excess of exports over imports fell nearly 25,000,000 rupees short of covering acknowledged Government drawings alone, if we

include Government imports in the total. Leaving out these imports, which we know to be substantially always paid for with borrowed money, and dealing with the trading figures alone, the excess of the exports for the whole of these ten years only overtopped the total amount of the Indian Council's drafts upon Indian Treasuries by about 3,000,000 rupees. That is to say, in reality, India has had to give the entire value of her exports over imports to cover the Home obligations of her Government.

It is clearly hopeless under such an economic condition for the Government of India to hope to maintain an average rate of exchange of 1s. 3⅜d. per rupee, now when the trade of the country has been disorganised by the currency bounties; and the consequence of its attempt to draw up to £16,000,000 in the coming year must be a fall in the exchange, unless the borrowings of the State, or of its guaranteed railway companies, are largely augmented in order to create an artificial credit for India in London. This is the actual position, and in face of it it is worse than folly for Indian officials to persist in imagining that they can control the rate of exchange in spite of economic laws, common sense, and past experience. India has one source, and one alone, out of which to meet the enormous obligations laid upon her in England by her British rulers, and that source is the excess value of her exports over that of her imports. Unless this excess could be increased beyond any precedent, India must continue to live by loans, and when loans are no longer possible cannot fail to suspend payment. This is as plain as that two and two make four.

At the end of the Viceroy's telegram we have a jubilant paragraph, setting forth how wonderfully India has prospered during the past twenty years. We quote it here, as it may be interesting to refer back to one of these days when the dreams of the romancer are over:

"So far as revenue goes, we have, even after charging off Rx. 13,660,000 spent from revenue account on construction of railways, more than paid our way, including all expenditure on war, special defence works, and famine. So far as capital transactions go, we have raised under various conditions, and spent upon railway and irrigation works, harbour works and docks, municipal projects, and agricultural improvements, a sum equal, at 1s. 4d. per rupee, to Rx. 198,820,000, and we are, after all this expenditure, better off by Rx. 500,000 per annum than before we undertook it. Moreover, it must be remembered, this view is concerned with direct financial returns only, and omits any consideration of the effect of all this expenditure on development of revenue and of its economic and administrative aspects." These results and the signs of early recovery from the disasters of famine, plague, and war are used to repeat and enforce Sir J. Strachey's deprecation of assistance from the English Exchequer.

It is impossible to test in detail such figures as are here quoted. They are, indeed, purely fanciful, but some facts contained in the statistics of India deserve to be considered against them, and among the most striking of these, as bearing upon the prosperity of the Natives under our rule, are the figures relating to what we may call, in Irish language, the "evictions" of the Indian agricultural population from their holdings. These figures are both startling and melancholy. Between 1882 and 1887 the total number of "compulsory transfers of real property" in British India never amounted in any one year to 1,000,000. The total was 756,780 in 1882, and 948,513 in 1887, according to one "Statistical Abstract"; according to another and later, the total in 1887-8 was 1,230,089. This had risen to 1,469,936 in 1890-91, to 1,729,850 in 1891-92, to 1,793,406 in 1893-94, to 1,817,767 in 1895-96, the latest year for which we have the returns. In the year just preceding, it had been a few thousands higher still. Voluntary transfers of the same kind of property also increased during the same period, but not at the same ratio. Assuming the figures for 1882 to be correct, the increase shown in 1895-96 over that year was fully 140 per cent. Surely this is a most important testimony to the increasing poverty of the people of the country under our rule. Grant that the revenues have been maintained, and that the State has done everything claimed in the passage just quoted, the fact remains that the evidence of distress among the people as the result of this success steadily accumulates. It could not be otherwise.

The people of India have been subjected for more than a generation to a forcing process nourished by liberal appeals to the money-lender. Had the great works of which the British administration boasts been created by economy, and paid for out of husbanded income, then, indeed, the Indian people would have had cause to rejoice in our rule. The reverse of this, however, has been the course pursued. Every description of extravagance has been committed without let or hindrance from home. On needless frontier wars alone, as Colonel Hanna has pointed out in his admirable little book entitled "Backwards or Forwards?"—wars on the North-West frontier, including those of Afghanistan, including the permanent increase they have necessitated in the British army of occupation, and the cost of the wasteful railway lines they have caused us to build—have been spent at India's charges between 1878 and 1896 no less than 714,850,480 rupees. In the same period the home charges of the Simla Government have increased by £8,000,000 per annum. The cost of the police in India has nearly doubled, the cost of the army has risen more than one-third, and the cost of the political departments has more than doubled—all within the same period. Through none of this frightful waste have the Indian people benefited to the extent of one single rupee, outside the wages paid to the additional troops and to the swarms of workmen who have secured employment in strategic railway and useless fortification building at the expense of the cultivators—mainly at the expense of the patient and industrious population of the Ganges Valley. Why will not the civil officials in India look at the matter from this common-sense point of view, instead of trudging around in a vicious circle, dreaming of imaginary rates of exchange, cooking up fancy statements to show how "prosperous" the country is, with their eyes wholly shut to the bottomless abyss towards which they are hurrying the empire, themselves and England?

The "Saturday Review."

The *Saturday Review* wrote:—While the telegraphic summary of the Indian Budget for the ensuing year, 1898-9, was singularly meagre, little more can be learned from the summary of the Budget debate in the Viceroy's Council which was reported in Wednesday's morning papers. To judge fairly of the present financial position and prospects in Calcutta, we must await the text of the Budget statement. At present we can see this much, that the accounts for 1896-7, having been finally closed, exhibit a deficit of £1,700,000; that for 1897-8 the deficit is estimated to amount to £5,280,000, but that the precise figure will not be known till the accounts for the past year are closed in March, 1899; and, finally, that the surplus for the ensuing year is estimated at £890,000. The net deficit on the three years is therefore, in round figures, £6,000,000. The cost, in 1897-8, of the famine was £5,390,000, which as nearly as possible answers to the amount of the deficit for that year. The war charges may therefore be regarded as having been defrayed from revenue, thanks mainly to rise in the rupee exchange, and in a secondary but very considerable degree to the postponement of railway expenditure and of other needful administrative charges. The net addition to the gold debt, by a contemplated loan of £6,000,000, will be £2,620,000; but no effort will be made to pay off any part of £3,380,000 debentures which, with £6,000,000 outstanding temporary debt, are to be "renewed" by fresh borrowings.

The estimated surplus for the ensuing year is a very untrustworthy item. It corresponds closely with a sum, amounting to £800,000, of arrear collections on account of land revenue, which, as the famine is over, will be now demanded from the landlord, and which is not, therefore, properly speaking, an asset of 1898-9. On the other hand, the loss from exchange will probably be less than that which has been calculated for the Budget purposes of 1898-9 at the average rate obtained last year, viz., 1s. 3⅜d.; and provision has been made in the coming year's Budget for what we hope may be regarded as an extraordinary credit for war expenditure. The estimate, therefore, for the coming year may be regarded, on the whole, as once more restoring equilibrium, should there be no war or other calamity. But—and this is a "but" so big as to reverse the whole position—it is equilibrium obtained solely by the maintenance of between six and seven millions of taxation which have been reimposed as "urgency" resources of late years. By far the greater part of this is taxation which is admitted by every Indian authority on finance to be most objectionable. The equilibrium thus contemplated is therefore only equilibrium resting on avowed instability. With the aid of the proceeds of renewed salt and customs duties, India may again hope to face her normal charges. But to talk of the "recuperative powers" of Indian finance, in these conditions, is worse than foolish. Note that very little more progressive aid can, in future, be expected from exchange, the rise in which during the last two years has been the mainstay of the finance of India, as its fall in previous years was the despair of Indian Finance Ministers. The rupee has now nearly reached the exchange figure of 1s. 4d. contemplated by the Indian Currency Act; and whatever else may be before him, Sir James Westland cannot count on further assistance from a continuation in the rise of the rupee exchange.

The invincible optimism of Sir James Westland in the midst of his ruined estimates is pathetic. Nothing turns out as was expected; but amidst the *débris* of his hopes we find him just as tenacious as ever of his calculation that but for this, and but for that, he would have had a thumping surplus. This attitude of mind may be natural to an officer of account, which was Sir James Westland's *métier* till he entered the Viceroy's Council as Minister; but it scarcely gives us much confidence in his sagacity as Chancellor of the Exchequer, or in his practical knowledge of the needs and the resources of India. Optimism in an Indian Finance Minister is necessarily absurd. The requirements of the country are limitless, while the limits to its taxable resources are notoriously of the most narrow. Equilibrium re-established in such conditions as those which now confront Sir James Westland should surely give a long-headed Minister pause; especially when he remembers that his revenue from opium is a decreasing item of receipt, thanks to Chinese competition, and that the currency is in a state that has again called for enquiry by the Committee.

The favourite resource of a Government in financial difficulty is to tamper with its currency. The Government of India has not proved an exception to the rule; and the conclusions of the Commission of 1893 are to be overhauled and corrected by the enquiries of a Commission of 1898. This is the outcome of the debate of Tuesday last, which is memorable chiefly for the fact that Lord George Hamilton avowed what his predecessor in reply to strictures on the Budget of past years had angrily denied, that the Government of India five years ago was "unquestionably nearing bankruptcy." It is to be hoped that the Commission will comprise one or more men of the Goschen stamp, and that it will not be overweighted, as the last Commission was, by Indian amateur financiers, by ex-official faddists, or by mere mouthpieces delegated from the India Council. It is difficult to believe that there is not a single representative of the Indian Exchequer on that council at present; and it is little, if at all, short of scandalous that at a time when the burning question of India is finance, there should be no Indian member of the Secretary of State's Council who has even an elementary knowledge of the one all-important subject. Sir James Westland might be more usefully employed in bringing the results of his special experience and knowledge to the board of the Committee, and in submitting them to the judgment and acumen of currency specialists, than in blowing bright estimate bubbles in Calcutta which collapse with the first breath of misadventure.

In view of impending enquiry it would be premature to examine the several positions somewhat rashly taken up by Lord George Hamilton. It may be that cultivation has not diminished; that prices of staple commodities have remained much the same; that the dearness of money in India is not identical with the scarcity of currency. It may also be that with the continuous pressure of a rapidly increasing agricultural population it is not to be expected that cultivation should decrease; that scarcity, famine, and war have maintained the prices of staple commodities; that the mints have been closed for five years, and that it is impossible without a constant flow of coined metal to find the necessary volume of a country's currency. We ask only that these and analogous propositions emanating from Calcutta or from Whitehall should be examined by impartial and competent men; that the Committee should not be packed with mere officials; and that the Indian mercantile element especially should be fully represented on the Committee; for at present it is mercantile experience only which can tell us where the currency pressure is most acute, and what are its most disquieting symptoms.

"FINANCE."

In an article entitled "Squeezing India," *Finance* said:—

The Government of India finds itself confronted with an actual realised deficit of Rx.1,700,000 for 1896-97 as well as with a prospective deficit of Rx.5,280,000 for the financial year 1897-98 now running to completion. The Budget estimate for 1898-99 indeed shows a surplus of Rx.890,000, but the wildest military financier would not care to stake his old cocked-hat upon the possibility of its final accuracy, and we may therefore for the time being reasonably disregard it. We have therefore a combined probable deficit for the two consecutive years 1896-1898 of Rx.6,980,000, say £4,650,000. Now, an exchequer whose aim it is to possess a reputation for solvency cannot get along on deficits, however golden its anticipations for coming years may be. The Indian Government, whatever the errors of judgment which we at least attribute to it, does try to be straightforward. Despite the curious complexity of its book-keeping system (we would not offend), when the Indian Government sees a fact, or thinks it sees one, it acknowledges and faces that fact like the martial spirit it is. So now it is spending more than it is getting. It cannot spend less, therefore it must get more. Additional taxation can afford but poor support, for it is the habit of the rayat, as soon as he finds himself with a grain of rice too much for his own stomach to hold, to propagate himself until consumption overtakes production; so that the margin of luxury available for taxation is not wide. Saddled with the impossibility of raising revenue to the level of expenditure, the Indian Government must of necessity borrow. Accordingly, the Secretary of State intends to raise £6,000,000 sterling as permanent debt, though of this sum £3,380,000 is required for the discharge of existing debentures, so that only £2,620,000 is fresh debt. He also renews £6,000,000 of outstanding temporary debt, but the responsibility for that belongs to the past; the present has quite enough to do to answer for its own sins. But a contemplated internal loan of Rx. 3,000,000 will apparently represent fresh debt, making, with the £2,620,000 previously referred to, a total of about £4,620,000.

Although we do not exactly echo the sentiment of an enthusiastic contemporary that "this state of affairs is simply appalling," we certainly think that it contains elements of danger which, if not detected and suppressed in time, may in all likelihood result in ultimate disaster. Now, we lay claim to a vast respect for the British public, for its sound, sober sense, and its general honesty of purpose. But the British public has not a notion about public finance; its fiscal convictions are imprinted by its favourite politicians, that is to say, after its own pocket. When the matter in hand is its own taxes, the British public splutters, reiterates with the utmost violence the arguments he has read that morning in the speech of the Chancellor of the Exchequer for the time being, or the Leader of the Opposition, as the case may be, quarrels with his best friend about it, and—pays. If he were not absolutely obliged either to pay, or to "have a man in," he would dismiss the matter from his mind, or, rather, never attempt to force an entry for it there. So it is with Indian finance. The magnificent sentimental side of the British public seizes upon the poverty of the poor Indian, and is very pleased to lay the whole responsibility for it upon the Government, and its frontier wars—and there is some truth in that. Mark, now, this general rule that the interest taken by the British politician in a given subject is exactly proportionate to that of the British voter. Naturally, then, his interest in Indian finance is of the most microscopic dimensions. His knowledge is perhaps even smaller. In fine, he treats it in much the same fashion as he treats the naval estimates, for instance, and other subjects of no importance; that is to say, he seizes the opportunity to go to see the last new play in order to recreate himself for the forthcoming important debate upon the domestic policy of the Sultan of Turkey.

It is often said, with some show of reason, that England is bound by common honesty, and according to every right standard at least to share the expense of these recurring frontier wars, if not to bear the whole. It is perfectly true that nine men out or ten in the three islands are ready and willing to say, "Pay it, and we will stand the racket and welcome!" But this is never done, and the natural consequence is that when periodically the subject of Indian finance crops up, people and Parliament shrug shoulders, shake heads, and observe with some surprise that after all things do not look so bad, but really there is too much complexity about the subject for the lay mind to cope with it, and after all the Indian Government is on the spot and has paid a lot of attention to the subject and must know best what is best, and ought to be given a fair field to do it. Besides, the question does not properly concern the British taxpayer, who has therefore no particular right to interfere. We have said that the British people would gladly contribute to the expense incurred in the protection and extension of the frontier of our Indian Empire, nor is it necessary here to elaborate the reasons why they should. What, then, is the obstacle? Strangely enough, the Indian Government is the obstacle; it refuses Imperial help. Why? Because at the moment when English taxpayers found their pockets touched they would discover a new interest in Indian finance; the shrewd eye of their legislators would reach the self-same conclusion simultaneously. The Indian debates would cease to be conducted for the benefit of a handful of old Indians and rows of empty benches. The frontier policy would cease to be a purely academic question. The Indian Government would be required to show good cause why we should go forward at any cost. The unrestrained domination of the military party would be at an end. Our own opinion is opposed to the policy of the soldier, but that is only an opinion. What we wish to insist upon—as we have done before, and shall do again unless our recommendations should be acted upon at once, which is perhaps a rather sanguine anticipation—is that the only way in which the expenditure of Indian money can be properly controlled is by causing the British taxpayer to be directly affected thereby; in short, by causing him to pay something towards the bill, and the more the better.

THE "SPECTATOR."

The *Spectator* said: Sir James Westland, the Indian Chancellor of the Exchequer, produced his Budget on the 21st inst., and as usual it is optimistic. He admits that the famine has cost in all Rx. 14,000,000, and that the plague and earthquake nearly Rx. 1,000,000 more; that the Secretary of State intends to borrow £6,000,000, and the Government in India Rx.3,000,000, while £6,000,000 of bills, which ought to be paid off, will be renewed. He gives, moreover, no estimate of the total expense of the Frontier Campaign, though Rx. 3,820,000 are put down under that head as outlay in 1897-98. He, however, believes that in 1898-99, owing mainly, as we may presume, to improvements in the exchange—which, however, are not mentioned in the statement—there will be a surplus of Rx. 890,000. That is very nice; but we should like, when Lord George Hamilton brings forward his Budget, to have the general history made a little clearer. How much of the total below is dead loss, and how much only matter of account?—

By famine	Rx. 14,000,000
Plague and earthquake	1,000,000
Borrowed at home	8,000,000
Bills not paid	8,000,000
Borrowed in India	3,000,000
	Rx. 34,000,000

There have been many surpluses, says Sir James Westland, in the last twenty years. Yes; but how much has the debt been swollen, and of that swelling, how much has been devoted to works actually reproductive in tangible cash? Lord G. Hamilton ought to tell us, but he will not. This is our single

complaint about Indian finance. There is no corruption and little waste, no misrepresentation, and perhaps no effort at concealment, but there is continuous and impenetrable fog.

Imperial Parliament.

Thursday, March 31.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases).—Petition of India Women's Christian Temperance Union, against State regulation; to lie upon the Table.

PAPERS PRESENTED.

ANOTHER FAMINE BLUE-BOOK.

East India (Famine).—Copy presented, of Further Papers regarding the Famine and the Relief Operations in India during the years 1896 7 (Vol. V, Narrative of the Famine in India in 1896-7, by T. W. Holderness, I.C.S.) [by Command]; to lie upon the Table.

East India (Opium).—Return presented, relative thereto [Address 25th March, Sir Joseph Pease]; to lie upon the Table.

A GOLD STANDARD FOR INDIA.

Mr. P. O'Brien asked the First Lord of the Treasury whether the Government would undertake to consult the views of the members of the House before giving consent to any fresh departure in the experiment of trying to introduce a gold standard into India.

Mr. Balfour: The hon. gentleman appears to be under the impression that a gold standard for India has been decided upon, but so far as I am aware that is one of the matters to be considered in the enquiry promised by my noble friend on Tuesday last.

Friday, April 1.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITIONS.

East India (Contagious Diseases).—Petitions against State regulation—from Newcastle, Waterloo and Cambridge; to lie upon the Table.

THE DEBT OF INDIA.

East India (Loans raised in England).—Copy presented—of Return of all loans raised in England chargeable on the revenues of India outstanding at the commencement of the half-year ended 31st March, 1898, etc. [by Act]; to lie upon the Table, and to be printed. [No. 142.]

Monday, April 4.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

PETITION.

East India (Contagious Diseases).—Petition from Edinburgh against State regulation. To lie upon the Table.

THE INDIA OFFICE STORE DEPOT BILL.

The Speaker laid upon the Table a Report from one of the Examiners of Petitions for Private Bills, pursuant to the Order of the House of March 30, to the effect that, in the case of the India Office (Store Depôt) Bill, the Standing Orders which were applicable thereto had been complied with.

THE NEW CURRENCY PROPOSALS.

Mr. Thomlinson asked the Secretary of State for India when the Government expected to be able to lay upon the Table the proposals for the reform of Indian currency in India lately received from the Government of India.

Lord G. Hamilton: As soon as the Committee, which is to consider and report upon the proposals of the Government of India, has been appointed, I propose to lay on the Table of the House copies of the recent despatch and of a preliminary reply which I have addressed to them.

THE INDIA OFFICE STORE DEPOT BILL.

Mr. Herbert Roberts asked the Secretary of State for India, whether he would put the Second Reading of the India Office (Store Depôt) Bill down on the Order Book at such a time as would give the House an opportunity for adequately discussing it.

Lord G. Hamilton: When the hon. gentleman has read the Bill to which his question refers he will see that it does not require discussion. (Cries of "Oh!")

THE STATE REGULATION OF VICE IN INDIA.

STRANGE TREATMENT OF A PRESBYTERIAN MISSION.

Mr. James Stuart asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was aware that the United Presbyterian Missionary Society had for 25 years rented a Government building at Nusseerabad as a mission hospital:

Whether the new regulations in reference to venereal disease amongst the troops in India were recently sent to Dr. Huntly, who was in charge of the hospital, and was asked if the mission would carry out the rules:

Whether Dr. Huntly replied that the mission hospital had been treating all Natives, including women, affected with the disease in question, and was prepared to continue such treatment, but that any examination of women for a purpose similar to that of the Contagious Diseases Act was out of the question:

Whether shortly afterwards six months' notice was served that Government would take away this building from the mission:

And, whether he proposed to take any action in the matter.

Lord G. Hamilton: I have not received any report on the subject, but if the honourable member will furnish me with the information on which his question is based, I will make enquiries.

Tuesday, April 5.

HOUSE OF COMMONS.

THE PLAGUE RIOTS IN BOMBAY.

DESPATCH NOT YET RECEIVED.

Sir Mancherjee Bhownaggree asked the Secretary of State for India, if he had yet received a despatch from the Government of Bombay on the riots which recently took place in that city:

Whether, if such a despatch had been received, he would state the particulars contained in it, especially as regards the origin of the riots:

And, if he would place the despatch upon the Table of the House.

Lord G. Hamilton: I informed my hon. friend a few days ago that I expected to receive a despatch on the subject of the Bombay riots shortly. I am now able to say that it will reach me in all probability about the 25th instant. As soon as it arrives I will consider whether a copy can be laid on the Table of the House.

THE NEW CURRENCY PROPOSALS.

Mr. Banbury asked the Secretary of State for India on what grounds the publication of the Indian Government's proposals for the reform of the currency was withheld until the appointment of the Committee of Enquiry.

Lord G. Hamilton: The enquiry which the Committee will have to conduct is, as the hon. member must be aware, of a rather delicate nature; and, when the proposals made by the Government of India on the same subject in 1892 were referred to a Committee, the despatch containing them was not published until the Committee had reported, about a year afterwards. I have, however, decided that on this occasion a different course may be adopted; but I consider it desirable that the publication of the proposals should be simultaneous with their reference to the Committee.

THE WAR BEYOND THE FRONTIER.

REPORTED SUBMISSION OF THE AFRIDIS.

Sir James Fergusson asked the Secretary of State for India whether he was in a position to inform the House that all sections of the Afridi tribes had submitted themselves to the Government of India.

Lord G. Hamilton: My latest information is to the effect that the terms of the Government have been accepted by all sections of the Afridis. These terms include a fine of rifles which has now been paid in full by all sections of the tribe, except a very small number still due from the Aka Khel section who have given hostages for their surrender. A gradual demobilisation is taking place of the forces in the neighbourhood of Tirah; a number of regiments being under orders to return to their quarters in India.

A scholarship of Rs. 20 monthly is to be given out of the Fund collected in memory of Mr. K. M. Chatfield, late Director of Public Instruction in Bombay (now retired), to a candidate (son or daughter of a schoolmaster or schoolmistress) who may obtain the highest marks in the Matriculation Examination, and who will afterwards carry on his or her study at one of certain colleges, or at the Victoria Jubilee Technical Institution. This scholarship will be called the "Chatfield Scholarship." A prize of Rs. 100 is also to be awarded from the fund to the girl of purely Native parentage who obtains the highest number of marks in the Matriculation Examination.

A portrait of the late Mr. Manomohan Ghose has been lately placed in the Hall of the Calcutta University Institute, Calcutta. It was subscribed for by the student community of Calcutta. Mr. Satyendra Nath Tagore presided at the unveiling of the picture, when Mr. Justice Guru Dass Banerji, Mr. M. C. Banerjee, and many other friends of Mr. M. Ghose were present. The portrait is by a Bengali artist, and is said to be an excellent likeness.

The annual meeting of the Anglo-Indian Temperance Association was held on Monday evening (April 4) at the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, Mr. Samuel Smith, M.P., presiding. Mr. W. S. Caine read the report, which stated that good progress had been made, notwithstanding the general unrest in India. Thirty new societies had been formed, mostly in the Bengal Presidency. Temperance literature had been multiplied, while the lecturers, honorary and stipendiary, continued to do good work. They were very careful not to come into conflict with the authorities, and on the whole had been very successful in this respect. Only one of them was arrested for lecturing and singing in public, and he was released after a detention of only three hours. The balance sheet showed a balance in hand of £76, which would be utilised for sending the secretary (Mr. Grubb) on a tour of inspection in India.

The report was adopted on the motion of the Chairman, who said the cause was steadily forging ahead. In ten years they had covered India with a network of total abstinence societies. Sir Wm. Wedderburn, the Hon. Conrad Dillon, and other speakers followed. Amongst the resolutions agreed to was one welcoming the declaration of the Government that not only would opium-smoking be prohibited in opium shops, but that the sale of madak would be discontinued throughout British India, and calling on the Government to complete their new policy by suppressing the opium-smoking saloons and clubs carried on by private enterprise.

THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS.

OFFICERS IN INDIA.

PRESIDENT (elected 1897):
HON. C. SANKARAN NAIR.

GENERAL SECRETARY:
A. O. HUME, C.B., ROTHNEY CASTLE, SIMLA; and THE CHALET, UPPER NORWOOD, S.E.

JOINT GENERAL SECRETARY (in India):
D. E. WACHA, 84, HORNBY ROW, BOMBAY.

STANDING COUNSEL:
Bengal, W. C. BONNERJEE;
Bombay, PHEROZSHAH MEHTA;
Madras, RAI BAHADUR ANANDU CHARLU.

BRITISH COMMITTEE.

Sir W. WEDDERBURN, Bart., M.P., *Chairman*.
W. S. CAINE.
G. B. CLARK, M.P.
A. O. HUME, C.B.
J. SEYMOUR KEAY.
H. S. KHALIL.
W. S. B. MACLAREN.
DADABHAI NAOROJI.
HERBERT J. REYNOLDS, C.S.I.
J. HERBERT ROBERTS, M.P.
C. E. SCHWANN, M.P.
ROBINSON SOUTTAR, M.P.
ALFRED WEBB.
W. MARTIN WOOD.

OFFICES: 84 AND 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, LONDON, S.W.

TELEGRAPHIC ADDRESS: "INCAS, LONDON."

NAME OF CIRCLE.	JURISDICTION.	NAME AND ADDRESS OF SECRETARY OR SECRETARIES.
1. Calcutta	Presidency, Burdwan and Chittagong Divisions (*except* Murshidabad District) Assam & Orissa	J. Ghosal, Esq., Nolin Behari Sircar, Esq., and Raja Binoy Krishna Deb Bahadur; 62 Bow Bazar Street, Calcutta.
2. Dacca	Dacca District	Babu Sarat Chandra Bose, Pleader, Rajar Deory, Dacca.
3. Maimansingh ...	Maimansingh District	Babu Anath Bandhu Guha, Sec., Maimansingh Association, Maimansingh.
4. Faridpur	Faridpur District	Babu Ambica Churn Mozumdar, Pleader, Faridpur.
5. Barisal	Bakarganj District	Babu Awsini Kumar Dutt, Pleader, Barisal.
6. Rangpur	Rangpur District	Joges Chandra Das Gupta, Pleader, Rangpur.
7. Dinajpur	Dinajpur District	Babu Madhab Chander Chatterjee, Dinajpur.
8. Pabna...	Pabna District	Babu Harendra Narain Roy, B.L., Pabna.
9. Bogra	Bogra District	Babu Peary Sunker Das Gupta, L.M.S., Medical Practitioner, Bogra.
10. Jalpaiguri	Jalpaiguri District	Babu Umagati Roy, Jalpaiguri.
11. Rampur-Beauleah ...	Rajshahyi District	Dr. Chandra Nath Chowdry, Rampur-Beauleah.
12. Berhampur	Murshidabad District	Babu Boikunt Nath Sen, Berhampur, Dist. Murshidabad.
13. Bhagalpur	Bhagalpur Division (*except* Purneah District) ...	Babus Siva Sankar Sahai and Surya Prosad, Bhagalpur.
14. Purneah	Purneah District	Babu Jogendra Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Purneah.
15. Chutia-Nagpur ...	Chutia-Nagpur Division	Rai Jodu Nath Mukerji, Pleader, Hazaribagh.
16. Behar	Patna Division (excluding the Muzaffarpur and Gaya Districts)	Babu Banwari Lal, Patna City.
17. Muzaffarpur ...	Muzaffarpur District...	Babu Shorashi Charan Mitra, Pleader, Muzaffarpur.
18. Gaya	Gaya District	Babus Nand Kishore Lal and Upendra Chandra Mittra, Gaya.
19. N.-W. Provinces ..	North-Western Provinces	Secretary, Standing Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.
Sub-divisions of the Name of Sub-division.	*N.W.P. for the purpose of distributing* "INDIA." Jurisdiction.	
Gorakhpur ...	Gorakhpur Division	A. Nundy, Esq., Gorakhpur.
Benares	Benares Division (*except* Mirzapore District) ...	Pandit Channu Lal, Benares City.
Mirzapur	Mirzapur District	Babu Sri Ram, Mirzapur.
Cawnpur	Cawnpur District	Pandit Perthi Nath, Cawnpur.
Bareilly	Bareilly District	The Secretary, Congress Committee, Bareilly.
Moradabad ...	Moradabad District	N. C. Bose, Esq., Moradabad.
Saharanpur ...	Saharanpur District	Babu Anand Swarupa, B.A., LL.B., Vakil, Saharanpur.
Meerut	Meerut District	Babu Prahlad Singh, Meerut.
Aligarh	Aligarh District	Hafiz M. Abdur Rahim, Esq., Aligarh.
Agra	Agra Division	Babu Tulsi Ram Misra, Mursan, Dist. Aligarh.
Allahabad ...	All places in the N.W.P. not above enumerated	Pandit Madan Mohan Malaviya, Sec. for the N.-W. P. Circle, Allahabad.
20. Oudh	Oudh	Munshi Ganga Prasad Varma, Office of the *Advocate*, Lucknow.
21. Punjab	The Punjab	Lala Jrishi Ram, Secretary, Congress Committee, Lahore; Babu Chetan Anand, Multan; Bhagat Ram, Esq., Barrister-at-Law, Jalandhar City; Lala Murli Dhar, Pleader, Ambala City; Babu Kedar Nath, Pleader, Delhi; and Pandit Perthi Nath, Pleader, Peshawur.
22. Bombay	Bombay Island, Colaba, Thana & Ratnagiri Dists.	D. E. Wacha, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay.
23. Sind	Sind	Tahilram Khemchand, Esq., Pleader, Karachi; Himatsing G. Advani, Esq., Shikarpur; and Hiranand Khemsing, Esq., Haidarabad.
24. Ahmedabad	Ahmedabad, Kaira and Panch Mahals Districts, Cutch and Kathiawar, Rajkot	Rao Saheb Kesavalal Motilal and Ratanlal Ranchhoddas, B.A., Pleaders, Ahmedabad.
25. Surat	Surat and Broach Districts, with Baroda ..	Hardevram Nanabhai Haridas, Esq., and Bhagubai Dayabhai, Esq., Surat.
26. Sholapur	Sholapur District	Vishem R. Lele, Esq., Sholapur.
27. Bijapur	Bijapur District	Krishnaji Raghunath Natu, Esq., B.A., LL.B., Bijapur.
28. Belgaum	Belgaum District	V. A. Natu, Esq., District Assoc., Belgaum.
29. Dharwar	Dharwar District	Sec., Standing Congress Committee, Dharwar, and Raghunath A. Sule, Esq., Hubli.
30. Satara	Satara District	Raghunath Pandurang Karandikar, Esq., High Court Pleader, Satara.
31. Ahmadnagar ...	Ahmadnagar District	Shankar Gangadhar Ranade, Mohenlal Hiralal and Kashinath Vinayak Bhawe, Pleaders, Ahmadnagar.
32. Poona	Poona, Nasik, & Khandesh Dist. (*except* Bhusawal)	Kashi Nath Govind Natu, Esq., Narayan Bapuji Kanitkar, Esq., and Laxuman Raghu-nath Gokhale, Esq., Poona.
33. Ichalkaranji... ...	Southern Mahratta Country	Sadashiv Ramchandra Apte, Ichalkaranji, near Kolhapur, S.M. Country.
34. Berar	Berar	R. N. Mudholkar, Esq., and B. H. Karandikar, Esq., Pleaders, High Court, Amraoti.
35. Nagpur	Central Provinces	Kesava Gopal Tamhan, M.A., Morris College, Nagpur.
36. Madras	Madras, Chingleput, N. and S. Arcot, Nellore and Native States	M.r.ry. V. Ryru Nambiar, High Court Vakil, Madras; M.r.ry. S. H. Belgrami, Barrister-at-Law, Madras, Secs., Mahajana Sabha.
37. Madura	Madura and Tinnevelli	M.r.ry. G. Srinivasa Row Garu, Pleader, Madura; M.r.ry. K. R. Gurusami Iyer, District Court Pleader, Tinnevelli.
38. Tanjore	Tanjore and Trichinopoli	M.r.ry. S. Ramachandra Iyer Aol, High Court Vakil, Tanjore; M.r.ry. K. Vasudeva Iyengar, Mirasidar, Srirangam; M.r.ry. N. Vydianadha Iyer, M.A., Kumbakonum; M.r.ry. P. Rathna Sabapathy Pillai, Pleader, Negapatam.
39. Bellary	Bellary, Anantapur, Cuddapah, and Karnul ...	M.r.ry. Srinivasa Row Garu, B.A., Pleader, Bellary; M.r.ry. Dhone Subba Row Garu, Pensioned Deputy Tahsildar, Karnul.; Hon. Rai Bahadur C. Jambulinga Mudaliar, B.A., M.L., Cuddapah; M.r.ry. P. Kesava Pillai, Pleader, Gooty.
40. Malabar	Malabar and Kanara...	Hon. C. Sankara Nair, Poonamalli Road, Egmore, Madras; M.r.ry. K. C. Manavikraman Raja, Secretary, Kerala Mahajana Sabha, Calicut; M.r.ry. T. Viraraghava Iyer, Palghat; M.r.ry. T. C. Naraina Kurup, High Court Vakil, Tellicheri; Rao Bahadur N. Shiva Row, Pleader, Mangalore.
41. Salem	Salem	Hon. C. Vijiaraghava Chariar, B.A., Pleader, Salem.
42. Coimbatore	Coimbatore and Nilghiris	M.r.ry. C. M. Padmanabha Chariar, B.A., B.L., Coimbatore.
43. Ganjam	Ganjam, Vizagapatam, Godavari, and Kristna	M.r.ry. B. Surianarayana Rao Garu, Vizagapatam; M.r.ry. C. Rungachariar, High Court Vakil, Musulipatam; M.r.ry. D. Subramaniem, Pleader, Coconada.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.—Intending Subscribers to "INDIA" should communicate with the gentleman whose name appears as Secretary to the Congress Committee for the district in which they reside, or with the London Office. All the gentlemen so named are in monthly correspondence with England, and receive a certain number of spare copies of "INDIA" to enable them to obtain new Subscribers, and are authorised to receive subscriptions to the Journal, which are payable in advance. They will also from time to time transmit to London the names of Subscribers who have paid, so that all such Subscribers may receive their copies direct from England every week. Subscribers are requested in giving notice of any alteration in their address, to quote the number on the covering wrapper of their copies of "INDIA."

TO ADVERTISERS.—Intending Advertisers should apply for terms to any of the following: The Manager, "INDIA," 84, Palace Chambers, Westminster, London, S.W.; The Secretaries, Calcutta Congress Committee Offices, 11, Clive Street, Calcutta; D. E. WACHA, Esq., Presidency Association, Bombay; The Secretaries, Mahajana Sabha, Madras; SANGAM LAL, Esq., Secretary Congress Committee, Lahore; Secretary, Congress Committee, Johnstonganj, Allahabad.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Applications for rates for Advertisements in "INDIA," should be made to

THE MANAGER,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers,
Westminster, S.W.

Advertisements should reach the Office not later than first post on Thursday in order to ensure insertion in the issue of the following day.

In Crown 8vo, *cloth, price* 7s. 6d.

THOMAS BEST JERVIS,

LIEUT.-COL. BOMBAY ENGINEERS, H.E.I.C.'s SERVICE, DIRECTOR OF THE TOPOGRAPHICAL AND STATISTICAL WAR DEPARTMENT.

A Biography by his Son, W. P. JERVIS.

"The biographer has done his work with judgment and discretion, and has produced a work of considerable general utility and interest." *Glasgow Herald.*

"A faithful autobiography. As being a centenary tribute by his son, there is much relating to the condition of India in former times, the better enabling us to judge of the progress manifested in that country of late years."—*Western Daily Mercury.*

ELLIOT STOCK, 62, PATERNOSTER ROW, LONDON, E.C.

OUDH COMMERCIAL BANK, Ld.,

FYZABAD, OUDH.

CAPITAL—Rs. 2,00,000. RESERVE FUND, Rs.80,000.
WORKING CAPITAL, Rs.16,00,000 and over.

FIXED DEPOSITS OF Rs.100 AND UPWARDS ARE RECEIVED AT 5½ PER CENT. PER ANNUM FOR 12 MONTHS CERTAIN.

Detailed Rules on application.

RAM SARAN DAS, M.A., F.A.U., M.R.A.S., *Manager.*

TOOTH-ACHE

CURED INSTANTLY BY

BUNTER'S NERVINE

Prevents Decay, Saves Extraction, Sleepless Nights Prevented.

Neuralgic Headaches and all Nerve Pains removed by BUNTER'S NERVINE. All Chemists, 1s. 1½d.

"INDIA." Vol. VIII. (1897.)

NOW READY.

BOUND IN CLOTH (post free), 8/6, *net cash.*

To be obtained at the Offices,
84 & 85, PALACE CHAMBERS, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

A limited number of VOLUMES V. (1894), VI. (1895), *and* VII. (1896) *can be obtained at the same price. Remittances should accompany order.*

English Newspapers, Books, Magazines, &c.

WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS, Ltd.,

WHOLESALE AND EXPORT BOOKSELLERS, STATIONERS, AND NEWSVENDORS,

CANNON HOUSE, BREAM'S BUILDINGS, LONDON, ENGLAND.

(*Established* 1809.)

Orders for ENGLISH BOOKS, MAGAZINES, PERIODICALS, NEWSPAPERS, &c., punctually attended to, carefully packed, and despatched by first mails to Australia, Tasmania, New Zealand, India, China, and throughout the world.
Remittance, or reference for payment in London, to accompany all orders.
Advertisements and notices of Births, Marriages, and Deaths inserted in all the English Newspapers. Send for a Complete List of English and Foreign Newspapers, Magazines, &c. Also for Catalogue of Works and Text Books in the Oriental Languages.

6d. Weekly.]

THE "HOME NEWS"

Is the BEST SUMMARY of EUROPEAN INTELLIGENCE.

SPECIALLY PREPARED FOR

INDIA, CEYLON, CHINA, and AUSTRALASIA.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY.

THE "HOME NEWS" Will keep readers posted up in all Political, Social, Literary, Dramatic, and other movements.

THE "HOME NEWS" Contains Original and Special Matter, and gives the cream of the European Newspapers.

Ask the Local Newsagent to get it, or send Subscription direct to the Publisher.

Subscription, including postage, payable in advance—

Period.	All places abroad.	In United Kingdom.
Three Months...	£0 7 7	£0 7 1
Six Months ...	0 15 9	0 14 1
One Year ...	1 10 4	1 8 2

CHEQUES AND P.O. ORDERS TO BE MADE TO THE ORDER OF GRINDLAY & Co.

OFFICES: 55, PARLIAMENT STREET, LONDON, S.W.

THE STORY OF THE MALAKAND FIELD FORCE.

An Episode of Frontier War.

BY

WINSTON L. SPENCER CHURCHILL,
Lieutenant, the 4th Queen's Own Hussars.

With Maps, Plans, etc.

Crown 8vo. 7s. 6d.

LONGMAN, GREEN & CO.,
LONDON, NEW YORK, AND BOMBAY.

NOW READY.

CONGRESS GREEN-BOOK: No. 1.

THE SKELETON AT THE (JUBILEE) FEAST.

BY SIR W. WEDDERBURN, BART., M.P.

(Being a series of Suggestions towards the prevention of Famine in India. Reprinted from "India.")

Obtainable from the
BRITISH COMMITTEE OF THE INDIAN NATIONAL CONGRESS,
84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.

Price Sixpence, or Six Annas, net.

"Louene"

A Simple, Safe, & Reliable NERVE SEDATIVE.

GUARANTEED PURELY VEGETABLE AND NEITHER OPIATE NOR NARCOTIC IN ITS ACTION.

For NEURALGIA, NERVOUS HEADACHE, FACEACHE, SLEEPLESSNESS, and other Nervous Troubles.

The EARL OF MOUNT-CASHELL writes: "Acted like magic, and relieved pain almost immediately."

The COUNTESS OF BANTRY writes: "A good remedy for sleeplessness."

PRICES, 2/9 and 4/6 per bottle. Post free in the United Kingdom, 3/- and 4/9. Foreign postage extra.

Pamphlet, containing many valuable Medical and other Testimonials, post free on application to

THE LOUENE CO., 43, KING WILLIAM STREET, LONDON, E.C.

Printed by A. BONNER, 1 & 2, Took's Court, London, E.C., and Published for the Proprietors at 84 & 85, Palace Chambers, Westminster, S.W.